

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JULY, 1897.

ARTICLE I.
MELANCHTHON AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.
BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

THE PREPARATION.

January 21st, 1530, Charles V., issued a mandate from Bologna announcing a Diet of the Empire at Augsburg to be opened, April 8th. One of the objects of the Diet was "to consult and decide about the disturbances and dissensions in the Holy Faith and the Christian Religion."* He promised that all opinions should be "heard, understood and considered in love and kindness, so that what is not right in both parties may be abolished, and all may live together in one Church."

The Imperial Rescript reached Torgau, March 11th. The Elector, following the advice of his counsellors, at once began to make the necessary preparation for the journey to Augsburg. Luther, Jonas, Melanchthon, Musa of Jena, Agricola and Spalatin, were to attend "as learned counsellors." The two first named were to remain at Nuremberg and await further decision. Agricola was to serve as preacher, and "Master Spalatin was to be used for faith and other things in connection with the other counsellors."†

*Förstemann. *Urkundenbuch*, I., 2. †Förstemann, I., 14.

Chancellor Brück suggested that their party should prepare a written statement, amply fortified by Scripture, and have it in readiness, so that in case the preachers should not be permitted to participate in the Diet, such statement could be presented, and might serve to facilitate business and to remove misunderstandings.* The Elector, acting, it is believed, on this suggestion, March 14th, informed his Wittenberg theologians of the proposed Diet, and expressed the conviction that "a great and unavoidable need will require that we have all the articles about which there has been controversy, both in faith and in other external church usages and ceremonies in such a form, that before the opening of the Diet, it may be fully decided, whether, or in what manner, or how far, we who have received the pure doctrine, may and can enter upon negotiation before God and with a good conscience. As none understand such things better than yourselves it is our gracious desire, that, laying aside all other business, you address yourselves to these things, and have them ready by next Sunday (March 20th) and come to Torgau with them on that day."†

This letter reached Wittenberg the same day on which it was written. Jonas was absent on the Visitation, but was immediately recalled by Luther, who writes: "We are to finish before next Sunday what things are necessary for the Diet, April 8th."‡ He does not say one word about composing articles. Whether articles were composed, and if so, what they were, or where they are, cannot now be determined with certainty. We do know that the theologians did not go to Torgau, March 20th. If they disobeyed the Electoral command in one thing, they may have disobeyed it in another. March 21st the Elector writes them another letter, urging them to come to Torgau, and to bring their books with them, as other things awaited their attention.§ Melanchthon was in Torgau, March 27th. But Luther probably did not go.|| It is not a matter of contemporaneous record that Melanchthon took any "articles of faith and ceremonies" with him to Torgau. The Electoral Rescript had

*Fürstemann, I., 39.

†Ibid. 42-4.

‡DeWette, III., 564.

§C. R. II., 33.

||Köstlin, II., 651.

not commanded that articles be *written*, though that is the implication. So unsatisfactory is our information on this point that the ripest scholarship can only affirm with Prof. Kolde: "A document with the title 'Torgau Articles,' or which on the basis of contemporaneous reports can with full certainty be shown to have been delivered at that time, we do not possess. Hence the most diverse conjectures have been promulgated. Yet the researches of Engelhardt (*Zh.-Th.*; 1865, 515, ff.) and especially of Brieger (*Kirchengeschichte Studien*, 1888, p. 268, ff.), have rendered it highly probable that the much sought 'Torgau Articles' are identical with an opinion (*Gutachten*) (Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68-84) which as an important document was taken by the Elector to Augsburg, and manifestly became the foundation of the subsequent Confession. And this is not contradicted by the fact that the writing in question, contrary to the Elector's order to report 'on faith and ceremonies,' treats only of the latter. For remembering that according to the admission of their opponents even, the doctrine preached in the Electoral lands, 'is Christian and comforting, and right in itself,' and that the Schism had arisen chiefly on account of certain abuses,' which had been introduced by the doctrines and statutes of men, and because they could not concede that their doctrine is new, or that it differs from the genuine true evangelical doctrine of the Church, the authors, according to their own declaration, limited themselves to the reasons for the abolition of those abuses. They also promised, in case there was a desire to know what else was preached in the Electorate, 'to present articles in which the entire teaching was embraced in an orderly way;' in general, also, a further elaboration of the original *Gutachten*, which had been hastily composed and was intended to be presented to the Diet by the Elector alone, was kept in view from the beginning, and was already resolved upon."*

If the essay A, given in Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 68-84, and in Jacobs' "*Book of Concord*," II., 75-86, be, or be a part of, "the Torgau Articles," then it is morally, if not demon-

*Prof. Kolde in *Real-Encyc.* (1896) II., 243. See also his *Augsburg. Konf.* p. 2.

strably certain, that no doctrinal articles were presented to the Elector at Torgau, for the reasons given in that essay, and summarized by Kolde. It is inconceivable that the Wittenberg theologians should say in that essay: "The things thus far stated are concerning external ordinances and customs," and promise "to give articles on the entire Christian doctrine in answer to a desire, should it be made," and then at the same time *present* articles of doctrine. Such action would involve a contradiction. Yet the question cannot be decided absolutely.* Nearly all of the older writers identified the Schwabach Articles either unchanged or slightly modified with the Torgau Articles. This theory was called in question by Bertram in 1767, and was attacked with very acute arguments by Weber in 1783. Many recent writers, as Köllner, Engelhardt, Knaake, Plitt and Gumlich, include the Schwabach Articles with others in the common designation: "Torgau Articles." But this latter supposition can have little or no practical bearing on the present discussion, since it is freely acknowledged that these Schwabach Articles form the *basis* of a *part* of the so-called doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession.

In 1833 Förstemann published certain essays discovered by him in Weimar. These he unhesitatingly proclaimed to be the long sought "Torgau Articles," and to make his theory the more plausible he supported it by the theory that the "Preface" (exordium) spoken of by Melanchthon in his letter to Luther, May 4th† is the doctrinal part of the Confession. For a time Förstemann was followed unquestioningly by some theologians in Germany and by some in America. But Förstemann's procedure was arbitrary and uncritical. He arranged the essays in an order, and distinguished them by the letters of the alphabet from A to F.‡ But the real order of these essays, which exist only in copy, that is, not in the hand of their author or authors, is D A B E F C. Förstemann made little or no critical comparison of these essays with other documents of the Reforma-

*See Brieger in *Kirchengeschicht. Studien*, p. 311.

†C. R. II., 39.

‡*Urkundenbuch*, I., 68-108. In English by Jacobs, II., 75-98.

tion era whose history is known, or can be pretty accurately traced. Hence careful criticism has greatly modified his theories, for rational conclusions they cannot be called. No competent scholar would now affirm so confidently as he did, that we really have the "Torgau Articles," much less that Melanchthon's "Preface" is the first or doctrinal part of the Confession. Long ago Bretschneider and Plitt gave ample reasons for rejecting this theory about the "Preface."*

It is true that essay A does say that the defense of the Elector may be introduced by "a long and rhetorical preface," but it is impossible to believe that Melanchthon would call the doctrinal articles of the Confession "a long and rhetorical preface," and then write to Luther that he had made that preface "somewhat more rhetorical." Besides, as will hereafter be shown, the entire weight of argument and of *testimony* is against the supposition that the "Apology" in its first form, or up to May 4th, had articles of faith. And as to the "Preface" we probably have that in the *Corpus Reformatorum* IV., 999 et seq.† At least we have a document there both long enough and rhetorical enough to meet the demands of this "Preface." Besides, this document is apologetic in character, and its title shows that it was intended for delivery to the Emperor. When circumstances required a "Confession" rather than an "Apology," and when it became more and more evident that this Confession was also a *state-paper*, a different kind of preface would be required, and a different kind we have in the Preface which introduces the Confession.

And in regard to the essays of which Förstemann declares: "That incontestably they were written upon order of the Elector by the Wittenberg Theologians, and that they are to be considered as without doubt the foundation of the second part of the Augsburg Confession," the most competent and conservative scholarship unqualifiedly excludes F D B and C from all claim of connection with the "Torgau Articles." In this there is substantial agreement between Bretschneider, Plitt, Engelhardt,

*C. R. IV. 999 et seq., *Einleitung* I., 523.

†Also in Förstemann, I., 63-66.

Knaake, Brieger and Kolde, all of whom were or are specialists in this line of historical research.* In the case of B D and F the proof is positive. B does undoubtedly form the first draft of Article 20 of the Confession: Of Faith and Good Works, and was composed by Melanchthon about June 3rd.† D was sent from Coburg to Augsburg during the Diet, probably very late in July, and consequently had nothing to do with the composition of the Confession.‡ Bretschneider, Engelhardt, and Brieger give unanswerable reasons for excluding F from the "Torgau Articles," and from participation in the composition of the Confession. Brieger says: "F had nothing to do with the Augustana." Knaake, whose pamphlet of eighty pages was written expressly to exhibit Luther's "Part in the Augsburg Confession," says: "No traces of this essay (F) are met with in the Augsburg Confession." Equally emphatic is Engelhardt.‡ And Kolde excludes all from consideration except A, which he has placed in his "Die Augsburgische Konfession," as the "Torgau Articles."

Neither Bretschneider, nor Engelhardt nor Plitt nor Brieger regard C, which consists of three parts—Of the power of the Keys, Of Excommunication, Of Degrees of Consanguinity—as belonging to the "Torgau Articles." According to Bretschneider the first part was composed at Augsburg, and as the first draft of Article 28, which Melanchthon was writing, May 22nd: "Now I am treating of the power of the Keys." (C. R. II., 60). Certainly Melanchthon's words do plainly intimate that he is working on a *new* article. Brieger says: "Nothing indicates that this essay was presented in Torgau." Engelhardt

*See C. R. IV., 973-4. *Einleitung* I., 320; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865) p. 550 et seq., Knaake's *Luther's Antheil; Real Encyc.* II., 243; *Kircheng. Stud.* 268 et seq. Knaake is editor of the new imperial edition of Luther's Works. Brieger is Prof. of History and Symbolics in Leipzig; Kolde, of same branches in Erlangen.

†See C. R. IV., 1005; Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865) p. 564; *K. Studien* p. 283-5.

‡See *K. Studien*, 283; *Luther's Antheil in der Augsb. Conf.*, 21. Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 554 et seq.

agrees with Bretschneider, while Plitt and Kolde join in the exclusion of C from the number of the "Torgau Articles."*

Brieger closes his learned and acute investigation of the subject of these four essays with the following words: "The foregoing discussion ought to be sufficient to banish documents F D B C from all scientific treatment of the Torgau Articles."† This result in its essential features had already been reached by Bretschneider, Engelhardt and Plitt, and has been accepted without qualification by Kolde, as already stated in other words. All this stands over against the hasty and uncritical generalization of Förstemann. He who would read all the facts and arguments should examine the references placed in our margin.

"The two longest essays, A and E, remain, as the only parts of Förstemann's discovery which can enter into the question, yet only in such a way that it can at once be shown that one of those two essays does not belong here. But in so far as Förstemann has not been blindly followed, there have been different opinions in regard to A and E. Bretschneider regards A as the first draft of the Confession, written by Melanchthon at Coburg. He looks upon E as written by Melanchthon at Torgau and only imperfectly (9 instead of 17) transmitted to us as the Torgau Articles. Plitt on the whole agrees with him. He thinks it was prepared at Wittenberg by Melanchthon. With Bretschneider he regards A as the first draft of the 'Apology.' Virck has recently declared emphatically that in E we have the desiderated articles. This he has sought to establish by the exhibition of a few almost word-for-word agreements."‡

Calinich thinks that A is only an elaboration of E; that E was Melanchthon's first work, which after consultation was revised by the aid of notes and suggestions from the other theologians.§ There is indeed resemblance in the subjects and in the method of treatment. But if E be the "Torgau Articles,"

*See C. R. IV., Niedner, *Zeitschrift* (1865), 562-4 *K. Studien*, 286-7.

†*K. Studien*, p. 289.

‡Brieger in *K. Studien*, 289. See Plitt's *Einleitung*, I., 321-4. *Zeitschrift für K. G.*, IX., 70-72.

§Luther und die *Augs. Conf.* p. 29.

then indeed was Melanchthon furnished with a very small *basis* on which to build the second part of the Augsburg Confession, since this essay consists of only about twelve hundred words, and these were written by Melanchthon himself. This would leave to him the indisputable right to be called the *author* of the second part of the Augsburg Confession.

But Engelhardt and Brieger, after the most careful comparison of E with A and with the Augustana, have reached the two-fold conclusion: "(1) *That E and A are independent of each other, and stand in no sort of relation, and (2) that E and the Augustana have nothing to do with each other, that at all events E did not form the foundation for the Confession.*"*

Only A is left. This essay consists of an Introduction, and of the following articles: Of the Doctrines and Ordinances of Men; Of the Marriage of Priests; Of Both Forms; Of the Mass; Of Confession; Of Jurisdiction; Of Ordination; Of Vows; Of the Worship of Saints; Of German Singing. The introduction is apologetic in character. Its aim is to vindicate "his Electoral Grace" against the charge of "dispensing with all divine service, and of introducing a heathenish dissolute mode of life and insubordination from which the destruction of all Christendom results." It declares that his Electoral Grace has always been inclined to peace and has helped to maintain peace. It then says: "To this effect it is well to place first a long and rhetorical preface." It says further that "his Electoral Grace" is making provision for the preaching of the Gospel, and that "every one even among the adversaries, must acknowledge that this doctrine, which is taught and written and treated, is Christian and comforting;" and finally: "The dissension now is especially concerning some abuses, which have been introduced by human doctrine and statutes, of which we will report in order, and indicate for what reason my lord is induced to cause certain abuses to be abated."

Several things are noteworthy in this Introduction:

(1.) It uses throughout the first person singular, as "my lord," not *our lord*, when speaking of the Elector. This shows

**K. Studien*, 291; *Niedner's Zeitschrift*, 561.

that the essay is the production of *one* man, not the joint composition of several.

(2.) It calls the adversaries themselves to witness to the purity of the doctrine taught in the Electoral lands.

(3.) It declares that the dissension has arisen principally on account of abuses.

(4.) It shows that the essay was written for the Elector alone, and consequently that it is Saxon in origin, and was intended to vindicate the *Elector* before the Diet.

If we turn to the articles we find that not one of them discusses a *doctrine*, but all treat of "human ordinances which cannot be observed without sin." The titles borne by these articles are in some instances identical, and in others nearly identical, with the titles which since its delivery has been given to several articles of the Confession, as the most appropriate designation for their contents. This is an accidental, though a very remarkable coincidence. If we examine the matter of the two sets of articles, we will find that the first part of Article 21 of the Confession, has its prototype at least in the article, Of the Invocation of Saints, in the essay. The same may be said of Article 22 in its correspondence with the article, Of Both Forms, in the essay, and of Article 23 as compared with the article of corresponding title in the essay, except that article 23 is expanded out of all proportion to the size of its supposed prototype. There is resemblance also in article 24 to the article, Of the Mass, in the essay, though by no means is there identity in subject matter, nor in the manner of treatment. The agreement between article 25, Of Confession, in the Augustana, and the article of the same name in the essay, is so striking as to make it almost certain that the latter was the antecedent or first draft of the former. Article 26 of the Confession, Of the Distinction of Meats, has no antecedent in title in the essay. It contains a few forms of statement that may be traced to the first article in the essay. There is no necessary relation between the two articles. In article 27 in the Confession, Of Monastic Vows, there are *points* of agreement with the article of the same name in the

essay, but the former contains four times as much matter as the latter. Article 28, Of the Power of the Bishops, is the longest in the Confession. It covers six pages in the New Market edition of the Book of Concord, and contains about 2700 words, as over against the article of similar name in the essay, which contains only 425 words. Brieger says that article 28 contains not a trace from A. Engelhardt says that only the fundamental thought is the same, but that the entire treatment is different.* In every proper sense of the word it is an independent article, and there is absolutely nothing to overthrow the supposition that Melanchthon was writing it for the first time, May 22nd.

Brieger sums up his exhaustive discussion with these words: "As a result of our comparison we may set it down that A *in fact has served as preparatory work for the Augustana*. The manner in which it is employed in Article 25, and in individual expressions of 23 and 24 and elsewhere, leaves no doubt of a perfectly demonstrable relationship, so that even in those articles in which we are not led necessarily to employ A, this essay has as a matter of fact furnished the basis for the further elaboration." Bretschneider, Plitt and Virch agree with this conclusion, though they think A was composed at Coburg. It makes but little difference as to the time and place of the origin of A. If it did not arise at Wittenberg, March 14th to 27th, then we must either fall back upon E as the "preparatory work" or deny that we have any "Torgau Articles."

But whether A arose at Wittenberg or at Coburg, it makes it perfectly clear that it was not the original intention to exhibit doctrinal articles before the Diet. Not only does A declare in the Introduction that the adversaries confess that the doctrines preached in the Electoral lands is Christian and comforting and without error, but it expressly promises: "If in addition there should be a desire to know what else my lord causes to be preached, articles may be given in answer, wherein the entire Christian doctrine is set forth in order, that it may be seen that my lord has allowed no heretical doctrine, but has had the Holy Gospel of our Lord Christ preached in the purest way, for even

*K. Studien, 304.

many of the adversaries must acknowledge that they have been better instructed, concerning many sublime and important subjects, by this doctrine which is preached in my lord's lands, than they were previously taught by the sententiaries and sum-mists."* This extract from the closing paragraph of A, taken in connection with the Introduction, shows beyond question that at the time A was written, it was the intention of the Saxon theologians, or at least of the author of this essay, to confine the defense of "his Electoral Grace" to matters pertaining to ceremonies, and not to touch articles of faith, unless such should be demanded. And this agrees perfectly with the fact that to the very last Melanchthon insisted that there was no dispute in doctrines; and even in the Epilogue-Prologue of the Confession itself he declared that no doctrines were taught which are discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Romish Church. And besides this, there is no documentary evidence that the "Apology" as Melanchthon had written it at Coburg, and as he reported of it to Luther, May 4th, contained doctrinal articles, that is, that it was not confined to the treatment of ceremonies, together with "a long and rhetorical preface."

But the question arises, Who was the author of A? Bretschneider, Zöckler, Calinich, Plitt, Knaake, Virck, Brieger and Loofs unite in excluding Luther. Brieger says: "Luther is excluded by reason of the manner in which he is here spoken of."† He alludes to the passage under Of Ordination: "It is to be apprehended that not many Dr. Martins will come after this time, who would control these important matters with such grace, and would avoid false doctrine and war."‡ Knaake declares that Luther's part in the preparation for the Augsburg Confession must be confined to the Marburg and the Schwabach Articles.§ The authorities given above unite in the supposition

**Urkundenbuch*, I., 83; Jacobs, II., 85-6.

†*K. Studien*.

‡Jacobs, II., 83.

§*Luther's Anthel*, 20, 25. In the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 219, Dr. Krauth says: "March 20. These XVII. Articles of Luther (the Schwabach Articles) revised were sent to Torgau, and were long called

that Melancthon is the author of A, that is, of "the *Torgau Articles proper*," except Loofs, who simply stops with the exclusion of Luther. Kolde, a most thorough and learned investigator shows plainly that he stands on the same side.

Such are the conclusions reached by the most eminent Lutheran scholars in the last thirty or forty years. The investigation has been conducted wholly in the interest of historical science. Reasons are given for every opinion, and the authority for every fact. There seem to be no blank affirmations, no strained interpretations, no forced translations. The documents themselves have been allowed to speak. In regard to the final question: Have we "*Torgau Articles proper*"? no absolute certainty has been reached, and hence no authoritative pronouncement has been made, but it is regarded as *highly probable* that a certain document bearing the title: "Judgment (Bedenken) of the Torgau Articles though they are in fact the revised Articles of Schwabach. These Articles are mainly doctrinal." The German scholars with all their research have found no contemporaneous documentary authority witnessing to the sending of "these XVII. Articles" to Torgau, revised or unrevised, on the 20th of March or at any other time. The German scholars deny that any such documentary authority exists. Dr. Krauth gave none. If any reader of this knows of such he will confer a great favor by naming it to the writer. Is not such a statement as Dr. Krauth makes at once confuted by the well-known fact that March 21st the Elector writes in impatience, and insists that his theologians shall hasten to Torgau?

Dr. Krauth goes on to say: "March 20. In addition to these, a special writing, of which Luther was the chief author, in conjunction with Melancthon, Jonas, and Bugenhagen, was prepared by direction of the Elector, and sent to Torgau. These Articles are on the Abuses, and are the *Torgau Articles proper*."

Again: Where is the documentary authority for the statement that "the *Torgau Articles proper*" were sent to Torgau March 20th or at any other time? German scholars declare there is none. Where is the like authority for the statement that Luther was the chief author of this "special writing" known as "the *Torgau Articles proper*"? German scholars again declare there is no such authority, and they unite in excluding Luther from such authorship, since the question of "the Torgau Articles proper" is narrowed down to a choice between A and E, with the balance greatly in favor of A.

Dr. Krauth says of the Schwabach and "the *Torgau Articles proper*": "Both these are mainly from the hand of Luther." In regard to the latter we ask for the proof, for none is offered.

the learned at Wittenberg on Ceremonies and what is therewith Connected, to be Presented to the Emperor,"* which we know was taken to Augsburg, is identical with the "Torgau Articles," is our A. If this be so then we know what is the *basis* of a part of the second part of the Augsburg Confession, and consequently who is best entitled to be considered as the author of that part of the Confession. If E be identical with the Torgau Articles, the question of authorship of the second part of the Confession, is practically unchanged, since this essay too is regarded by the highest and most learned authorities not as Luther's, but as Melanchthon's. This essay then of about 1300 words has been expanded into an essay, including Article 21, of nearly ten times so many words, to say nothing about the omissions, the introduction of new thoughts, the changes of order, the refinement of the style, and other qualities, which are peculiar to the Augsburg Confession as such.

THE COMPOSITION.

April 3rd Luther, Melanchthon and Jonas left Wittenberg for Torgau. The next day the Elector set out for Augsburg, having in his train besides "the learned counsellors," his son John Frederick, Francis Duke of Lüneburg, Wolfgang Prince of Anhalt, and Albert Count of Mansfield, with seventy noblemen and their escort numbering in all one hundred and sixty persons. Coburg was reached Friday, April 15th. Here the party rested till April 23rd, and here Luther was left, for reasons that need not now be mentioned.† Here, as is supposed, Melanchthon was commissioned to write an "Apology" to be delivered to the Emperor as a vindication of "his Electoral Grace" against the charge of having created or tolerated schism in religion. It is easy to see why this important work was placed in his hands. He was the most accomplished theologian, and the most polished writer among the "learned counsellors." He had written the *Visitation Articles*, and in all probability he was the author of the "Torgau Articles." Just what he wrote at Coburg and

**Urkundenbuch*, 138.

†Kolde in *K. Studien*.

on the way thence to Augsburg, which was entered May 2nd, is not known. May 4th he wrote to Luther: "I have made the preface (exordium) of our Apology somewhat more rhetorical than I had written at Coburg. But in a short time I will bring, or if the Prince will not permit it, I will send."* There is nothing in this letter which says what Melanchthon will bring or send. But the same day he wrote to Veit Dietrick, who was with Luther at Coburg: "In a short time I will run over to you in order to bring to the Doctor for examination the Apology which is to be presented to the Emperor."† What this *preface* was, of which we have already heard, is only a matter of conjecture.

Nor have we any means of knowing what the "Apology" was at that time. We may suppose that it had undergone considerable change between April 23rd and May 4th, otherwise Melanchthon would not have desired to submit it to Luther for examination. It probably consisted now of the "Torgau Articles" expanded pretty much into the shape of the second part of the Confession. There is at least nothing to indicate that at this time it contained articles of faith. Indeed the supposition of articles of faith at this time is excluded by what is said so emphatically in the "Torgau Articles" (A), namely, that there is no dissension about articles of faith, and that articles of faith would be presented, if desired. We know that it was the studied policy of Melanchthon to insist that in *doctrine* the Saxon churches had not departed from the Catholic Church, and up to this time no desire had been expressed to know "what else my lord causes to be preached."

But a new exigency now arises. Scarcely had the Diet been proclaimed when the dukes of Bavaria instructed the Theological Faculty of Ingoldstadt "to bring together in epitome all the articles which for twelve years had been advanced by Luther, and to show their discrepance from the true Christian faith, and the best method of refuting them."‡ This furnished an occasion

*C. R. II., 40. Ibid. 41.

†C. R. IV., 999.

‡*Real Encyc.* II., 244.

for John Eck to compose a book containing 404 articles extracted from the writings of those who were disturbing the Church. Passages torn from their connection were taken from the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Carlstadt, Zwingli and others, and placed under appropriate rubrics together with quotations from the writings of Anabaptists like Denk, Hubmeyer and others.* A manuscript copy of this book with a letter well calculated to exasperate, was sent to the Emperor by Eck, who promised to defend its propositions before the Diet. In order the more fully to attain his purpose of placing the Protestants at a disadvantage, he had the book translated into German for the people.† Melanchthon, who came into possession of a copy of this book at Augsburg, could no longer say, as was said in the "Torgau Articles." "Every one, even among the adversaries, must acknowledge that this doctrine, which is taught, and written, and treated, is Christian and comforting, and that in it there is no error." It was now evident that the *doctrines*, the articles of faith, were to be attacked before the Emperor and the Diet. The entire purview was now changed. The "Apology" was not broad enough. It could meet only a part of the enemies' charges. It had become necessary for the Lutherans to purge themselves from the accusation of heresy, and to repudiate the company in which they had been placed. The Apology must include articles of faith, so as to refute the slanders of Eck. Melanchthon had also learned from the official reports of John von Dolzig, whom the Elector had sent forward to negotiate certain matters with the Emperor, that his Majesty would have no time for long discussions about religion.‡ The slanders of Eck and the necessity for brevity furnish the stand-

*The title of Eck's book is: Sub domini Ihesu et Mariae patrocinio. Articulus 404 partim ad disputationes Lipsicam, Baden, and Bernen atinentes, partim vero ex scriptis pacem ecclesiae perturbantium extractos, Coram divo Caesare Carolo V. Ro. Imp. semper Augu. etc. ac proceribus Imperii, Joan. Eckius minimus ecclesiae minister, offert se disputaturum, ut in scheda latius explicatur Augustae Vin—delicorum. Die et hora consensu Caesaris posterius publicandis. Kolde's *Augs. Konf.* 4.

†Plitt. *Einleitung* I., 527.

‡*Urkundenbuch*, I., 173, 181.

points from which the Confession must henceforth be viewed. The damnatory clauses, the frequent references to the teaching of the early pure Church, the studied brevity in the first part of the Confession, have their explanation in these changed conditions, for there are no damnatory clauses in the Schwabach Articles, and but few references to the early Church, and there is greater fulness in the treatment of several of the corresponding Schwabach articles. Besides, after May 4th, we hear nothing more of the "long and rhetorical preface." Everything now must be put in the most condensed form consistent with truth and clearness, and with the demands imposed by the allegations of Eck's book. Plitt, Virck, Brieger, Kolde,* and others unite in the view that Melanchthon now resolved to include in the Apology articles of faith. Kolde's own words are:

"Upon learning of this writing, Melanchthon could no longer doubt that the Apology must extend itself over the articles of *faith*. But since the Emperor would have no time to hear long discussions in the defense of the evangelical doctrine against the slanders of Eck, he resolved to admit articles of faith, and to give the whole more the character of a *confession*."† For this purpose he would naturally fall back upon the Schwabach Articles, which at the convention of Schwabach bore the title: "Articles of the Elector of Saxony concerning Faith," and which, in revised form, had already, the last of April or the first of May, been sent forward and delivered to the Emperor at Innsbruck.‡ Dolzig's first report announcing the delivery of the articles to the Emperor, reached Augsburg, May 7th, and his second, stating that the Emperor would give but little time to the affairs of religion, came May 10th. Evidently between May 4th and May 11th Melanchthon had become acquainted with Eck's book, and had been assured of the need of brevity.

*See *Einleitung*, I., 530; *Zeitschrift für K. G.* IX., 71; *K. Studien*, 227; *Augs. Konf.* 4; *Real-Encyc.* II., 244. Küstlin (*Martin Luther*, II., 209) says: "The new attacks of Eck had now fully determined him (Melanchthon) to admit into it (the Apology) all the chief articles of faith."

†*Real Encyc.*, II., 244. *Luther's Leben*, II., 335.

‡See Brieger in *K. Studien*, p. 212-3, and Hans von Dolzig's reports in *Urkundenbuch*, p. 173, 181.

There could have been no need of acquainting the Emperor with the Elector's articles of faith, but there was the most imperative need of meeting and opposing Eck's slanders. It would require only a very short time for Melanchthon to compose the *first draft* of the *articulos fidei* on the basis of the Schwabach Articles, which he had helped to compose,* as doubtless he had prepared the articles sent already to the Emperor.

May 11th Melanchthon wrote to Luther as follows: "Our Apology is sent to you, though it is more truly a confession. For the Emperor does not have time to hear long discussions. Nevertheless I have said those things which I thought to be either specially profitable or proper. With this design I have brought together about all the articles of faith, because *Eck* has published the most diabolical slanders against us. Against these I wished to oppose a remedy. Do you in accordance with your spirit judge of the whole writing."† It will be observed that Melanchthon still retains the name "Apology," but he regards "confession" as the more appropriate designation. He hints at abbreviation, or at least at brevity. He declares that he has brought together almost all the articles of faith, because (*quia*) *Eck* has published the most diabolical slanders. The expressed design of bringing together these articles of faith is to oppose a remedy to these slanders; that is, the articles of faith stand in relation to Eck's slanders as effect to cause. This is the natural and necessary interpretation of Melanchthon's language. Moreover, what need could there have been of informing Luther of the bringing together of articles of faith, if it had already been determined from the beginning that such articles should be included, and had been included at Coburg? And this position is fully sustained by Melanchthon's own account of the composition of the Confession, the fullest and most

*Luther distinctly says in his first publication of the Schmalkald articles that he helped to compose such articles. *Erl. Ed.* 24, 337.

†*Hoc concilio omnes fere articulos fidei complexus sum, quia Eckius edidit διαβολιχωτάτας διαβολάς contra nos. Adversus has volui remedium opponere. Tu pro tuo spiritu de toto scripto statues. C. R. II., 45.*

explicit that ever came from his pen. It is found in the preface to the German edition of his *Corpus Doctrinae*, and was composed September 29th, 1559, or only a few months before he died. After speaking of the calling of the Diet by the Emperor, and of the diversity of views that followed, he says: "Also some papal writers had scattered slanders in the Diet, by which abominable lies were heaped on our churches, as that we had many damnable errors, and, like the Anabaptists, were heretical and seditious. Now an answer had to be made to the Emperor; and for the refutation of the slanders it was resolved that all the articles of Christian doctrine should be brought together in order, so that everyone might know that our churches were unjustly accused by these papal slanders."* There can be no doubt that Melancthon here alludes to Eck's "most diabolical slanders." He says "that all the articles of Christian doctrine were brought together" for the refutation of these slanders. It is again the relation of cause and effect. It is a new idea born under new circumstances, and is really the beginning of the Augsburg Confession *as such*.

The "Apology," *alias* Confession, in the form and to the extent in which it had now been composed by Melancthon, was transmitted, May 11th to Luther by the Elector, with the following letter: "After that you and our other learned men at Wittenberg, according to our gracious purpose and desire, had brought into summary statement the articles which are in controversy about religion, we will not conceal from you that now Philip Melancthon here has further revised them and has brought them into a form which we herewith send you. It is our gracious desire that you should not hesitate further to revise and consider them. And if they please you, or if you think to add or subtract anything, note it on the margin (*daneben*)†, and

*C. R. IX., 927.

†We have translated *daneben* "on the margin." In doing this we have followed such men as Weber, Schmidt, Kolde and others, who explain *danaben* in this identical passage of the Elector's letter, by *am Rande*, "on the margin." It is supposed that these German scholars understand their own language, and that they have no interest in perverting it in this passage. Dr. Krauth in the *Conservative Reformation*, p. 224, has trans-

in order that we may be ready at the arrival of his Imperial Majesty, which we expect soon, send back the same, well secured and sealed, immediately by this messenger."*

Luther's answer to this letter is dated May 15th: "I have read over M. Philip's Apology. It pleases me very well, and I know of nothing therein to be improved or changed; nor would it become me, for I cannot move so softly and lightly. Christ our Lord grant that it may bring much and great fruit, as we hope and pray."† Says Plitt: "Luther changed nothing; the 'Apology' pleased him, only the tone, he thought, was too mild."‡

Luther received the Confession in its *first draft*, in what the Germans call "der erste Entwurf," "der fertige Entwurf." We do not really know how *much* of the Confession Luther saw; but we do know that the Confession was very far from being in its final form. For instance, it did not yet contain Article 20, Of Faith and Good Works, which is nearly one-fourth of the so-called doctrinal part. We know further that Luther did not see Article 27 in its present form; and in all probability Article 28 had not then been written; that is, altogether he did not see fully one-third of the Confession in its final form. Melanchthon went on changing from day to day. What changes he made in the main will appear as we proceed.

May 22nd Melanchthon wrote to Luther again: "In the Apology we change many things daily. I have taken out the article *On Vows* (27), because it was too brief, and have supplied later it, "at the *same time*." If any reader knows of a reputable German scholar who has explained *danaben* in this passage by the equivalent of "at the *same time*," he will confer a favor by reporting it with book and place to the writer hereof.

*C. R. II., 47. It is at least worthy of remark that the Elector says in this letter that the theologians at Wittenberg had brought into summary statement the *controverted articles* of religion. He says nothing about doctrine. In the first draft of this letter it was written: "We have had it further revised, and with some words added, somewhat abridged." May the Elector not refer to the addition of the doctrinal articles, and the omission of the "*preface*"? *Urkundenbuch*, I., 191.

†De Wette, IV., 17.

‡Herzog, I., 773. See also Kolde in *Real-Encyc.*, II., 244.

its place with another on the same subject somewhat longer. I am now also treating of the power of the Keys. I wish you would run over the articles of faith. If you think there is nothing defective in them, we will treat the rest as best we can (utcunque). For they must be changed and adapted to circumstances."* Melanchthon makes this statement and request about the Confession *casually*, and as *one* item among many contained in this long letter. It is neither *said* nor *implied* that with this letter was sent to Luther a copy of the Confession, nor even a part of it. While writing this letter Melanchthon received a letter from Luther, undoubtedly that one written May 15th† in which there is *not one word about the Confession*.‡ There is no evidence that Melanchthon knew that Luther had returned the "Apology" to the Elector, and we have no notice of its having been returned before May 24th.§ Then it was in the hands of Chancellor Brück who "had to shape it before and behind." If it was brought by the messenger who brought Luther's letter to Melanchthon, as a matter of course it would be delivered to the Elector, or to the chancellor, since it concerned their business, not that of Melanchthon. Knaake and Engelhardt give the most satisfactory reasons for concluding that Melanchthon did not know that the "Apology" had been returned, as indeed it may not have been. It is the judgment of both these scholars that Melanchthon wrote under the supposition that the Apology was still in Luther's hands, since it had been sent to him both in German and Latin.|| C. R. II., 51. Two things are indisputable: (1) The letter contains not the slightest intimation of a *second sending* of the "Apology" or of any part of it. The whole face of the letter is against any such supposition. Hence they who write about a *second sending* are compelled to go outside of this letter for their proof, of which there

*C. R. II., 60.

†De Wette, IV., 16.

‡We must distinguish between Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector, and one of the same date to Melanchthon.

§C. R. II., 62.

||*Luther's Antheil*, 58, 68: Niedner's *Zeitschrift*, 572. Köstlin, II., 426, places the return of the "Apology" not earlier than May 22.

is none, and must *assume* that Melanchthon *knew* the Apology had been returned.* (2) The letter calls Luther's attention to the articles of faith alone (Article 20 had not yet been written) and declares that the rest shall be treated according to circumstances *utcuque*.

It is in dispute among the learned, whether Luther received this letter of May 22nd. But there are some things about this Augsburg-Coburg correspondence that are not disputed: (1)

*Dr. Krauth, *Lutheran Monographs*, pp. 27, 28, begins the support of his theory of a *second sending* by quoting Chytraeus (*Historia Augustanae Confessionis*, p. 32) in favor of a *second sending* of the Confession to Luther, May 22nd, and gives force to the quotation by representing Chytraeus as "doubtless hearing from Melanchthon's own lips the particulars connected with the great Confession at Augsburg." These are the facts: (1) In his *German* history of the Confession (Preface 1575) Chytraeus says *not one word* about a *second sending*, nor even intimates it. (2) In 1576-7 (See Preface) Coelestin published his History of the Confession, and says: "Yet (after Luther's approval May 15) Philip, some days after, sending a copy to Luther again (*remittens*), writes May 22nd." (We use Dr. Krauth's translation, who gives only a part). (3) In 1578 Chytraeus published his *Latin* History of the Confession, from *which* Dr. Krauth quotes. But lo! Chytraeus uses the very *same identical words* used by Coelestin, showing that he simply *appropriated* this statement of Coelestin, for which neither *gives any authority*: that is, instead of getting his supposed fact from "Melanchthon's own lips," Chytraeus takes an unverified assertion from Coelestin, whose reliability as a historian is utterly vitiated by the fact that he imposed upon his own Elector "a transcript from one of the less finished copies of the Confession" as a copy of the Original. Thus the first link in Dr. Krauth's chain is a link of sand. If he desired to present what Chytraeus heard from Melanchthon's own lips he should have quoted from the *German*, and not from the *Latin*, which was taken *bodily* from Coelestin. We invite scholars to examine Coelestin, I., 43^b, published in 1577, and Chytraeus, p. 32, published in 1578. Coelestin is the first to write about a *second sending*, but he gives no authority, and Dr. Krauth does not even *pretend* that he got the particulars from Melanchthon's own lips. Thus his authority is no authority. Again: We have examined nearly all of Dr. Krauth's witnesses, pp. 27, 28. The older ones simply give Coelestin and Chytraeus as their authorities. The later ones quote Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd as evidence that he continued to change the Confession after May 11th—which nobody ever denied. Thus Dr. Krauth's entire chain is no stronger than its first link. He hangs his theory on an unverified assertion, and that too in the face of the strongest reasons to the contrary. We ask for *proof*.

That we have no answer to this letter of May 22nd; (2) That from May 15th to June 29th there is not a solitary allusion to the Confession in Luther's extant letters (to Agricola, Jonas, the Elector, Melanchthon, the Landgrave, Schnepf) of which we have eight in DeWette; (3) That in Melanchthon's letters to Coburg after May 22nd to June 25th no reference is made to the Confession; (4) That Luther complains bitterly of the long silence of his friends at Augsburg,—one time he names "a whole month," another time, "three full weeks of continued silence"—and is so enraged that when finally letters do come, he refuses to read them.*

These things have been affirmed over and over again by the most impartial and competent scholars, and can be certified by any person who will take the trouble to read the letters extant in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, and in DeWette's *Luther's Briefe*.† Hence there is not the slightest evidence from extant letters, or from contemporaneous documents, that Luther exerted any influence on the *composition* of the Confession after the separation at Coburg, or that any word of his was given about the Confession after May 15th, or any assistance sought by any one after May 22nd, until June 25th. From the extant Augsburg-Coburg correspondence now under review, for more than a month one could not know that a confession of faith was being prepared in Augsburg.‡ But Melanchthon went on with his changes.§ May 28th the Nuremberg delegates, Kress and Vol-

*See DeWette, IV., 44. 45; C. R. II., 141.

†Pfeilschmidt says: "Three full weeks passed, from the end of May to June 19th, in which he (Luther) received no letters from Augsburg." *Luther in Coburg*, p. 57. Köstlin says: "For several weeks Luther's friends in Augsburg did not let themselves be heard from by him." II., 212; so Kolde in *Analecta Luth.* 126.

‡We might *infer* it from what Jonas writes to Luther, June 18th: "Within the next three days we will offer articles of faith." *Analecta Lutherana*, 126.

§Fikencher, after quoting Luther's letter of May 15th says: "But Melanchthon was not yet satisfied with it (the Confession), and almost up to the moment of delivery he changed so much by additions and omissions, by remodeling, and the introduction of entirely new articles, even by the choice of words, that a very different work resulted, though still based on

kamer, wrote home to their Senate "That the counsellors and theologians of the Elector are holding daily sessions on the Confession of faith, with the purpose of giving it such a form that it cannot be passed over, but must be heard."* Three days later they wrote that they have received a copy of the Confession in Latin, but that the preface and epilogue are still wanting, and that the Confession in German is daily undergoing improvements.† June 3rd they wrote that the Latin has the preface, but lacks the epilogue and an article or two behind, "on which the Saxon theologians are working."‡ June 8th they wrote: "The Saxon Confession (Verzeichniss) of faith which we last sent you (the Latin) has been laid before the preachers and Jurists for examination." Again: "The Saxons are not yet done with it." June 15th they wrote: "The Saxon Confession (Begriff) of faith is finished in German. Herewith we send it to you. It does not yet have the preface and the conclusion, and as *Philip Melanchthon* has stated, he has not put any part of those into German, because he thinks that this same preface and conclusion may probably be presented not alone in the name of the Elector, but in common in the name of all the Lutheran princes and estates, as he has already made a change in the German articles, as you will see: Namely, where in the Latin it is stated, that in the Electorate of Saxony, this or that is preached and held, here in the German he has omitted the Electorate of Saxony, and has put a common term in its place, the Torgau Articles. On each finished part Melanchthon received the opinions of the theologians present. He even wrote to Luther May 22nd for his opinion. But he (Luther) did not see the finished work until after it had been delivered to the Emperor." *Geschichte d. Reichstags zu Augsb.*, p. 53.

Knaake referring to Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd says: "We find the purpose expressed to send nothing more to Luther, because the remaining articles about the abuses to be abolished must be changed as required by times and circumstances—*reliqua utcumque tractabimus*; subinde enim mutandi sunt (articuli) atque ad occasiones accommodandi sunt. In the letters exchanged between Luther and Melanchthon henceforth there is to be recognized no influence of the former on the composition of the Confession." *Luther's Antheil*, p. 76-7.

*C. R. XXV., 207. †C. R. II., 78. ‡C. R. II., 83.

which may refer to all the estates. This Confession your Excellencies will now have your preachers and jurists examine at once, and will then immediately send us their opinion and judgment. Also because nothing is being done in regard to the preface and conclusion, and nothing has yet been agreed upon with Margrave George and us about it, we think an easy way might be for us to speak with Margrave George, and then in the name of his princely grace and of your Excellencies, the matter could be mentioned to the Elector. We present this to your further consideration, and we await your decision thereon, and especially your opinion about composing the preface and conclusion, or whether we should have such with common terms with reference to a confession (*Begriff*) in the name of all the princes, and should send the same (Confession) first to your Excellencies to be further examined."*

This letter of June 15th makes it unquestionably certain that up to this time it had not been *decided* by the Princes to offer a confession in common. (a) The Confession is still called the *Saxon Confession*; (b) Melanchthon regards it as "probable" that it may be used as a *common confession*; (c) no agreement has been made with the Margrave and the Nurenbergers; (d) the Elector has not been formally spoken to on the subject; (e) the Nurenbergers ask the advice of their Senate about "a confession to be presented in common terms." Hence up to this time there was no meeting of "Princes, other officials and preachers to discuss and determine upon the Confession in regular order sentence by sentence."† And yet strange to say the most important part of this letter, namely, that which most distinctly shows that no concert of action has been decided upon, has been ignored by Dr. Krauth in his "Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession."‡ That is, he has not translated the part so adverse to his theory.

Even up to June 15th-17th the Confession is only relatively

*C. R. II., 105.

†*Conservative Reformation*, p. 233.

‡Plitt says that nothing had yet been decided upon. *Einleitung*, I. 533. Krauth says that "it is hoped the Confession will be presented to the Emperor in the name of all the Protestants." *Chronicle*, p. 40.

finished, as we learn from the Nurenbergers' letter of June 19th.* No more articles were added, but the Epilogue is yet to be attached, the whole is yet to be examined by the princes and counsellors, the text is to be fixed, and the Confession is to be signed. And we know further that for at least two days Melanchthon practically suspended work on the Confession in the hope that the whole matter in dispute might be settled "in Enge und Stille."

June 15th the Emperor came. Early in the morning the princes assembled in the *Rathhaus* to arrange for his reception. There was a long dispute about precedence and rank. At two o'clock they go forth to meet him. He enters the city between eight and nine o'clock P. M., and detains the Protestant princes until between ten and eleven, haranguing them about interdicting preaching and about joining the Corpus Christi procession the next day. The excitement was so great that some were called out of bed, and informed of what was going on.†

June 16th. At seven o'clock A. M., the Protestant princes (the Elector excepted, who was indisposed on account of the late detention the previous evening) appeared before the Emperor, and gave reasons why they could not interdict preaching, nor enter the procession. They were detained until ten o'clock.‡ Then they visited the indisposed Elector, and there resolved to make a written answer to the Emperor. This appears to have been the first united action of the princes, but this action does not take in the Confession. They resolved to make reply to the Emperor in writing. Chancellor Brück wrote the long opinion, giving reasons why the evangelical princes could not interdict preaching; and the Saxon theologians prepared the *Bedenken* on the question, "Whether the Elector and other Protestant princes can take part without violation of conscience in the procession of Corpus Christi Day."§ In the contemporaneous re-

*C. R. II., 112.

†See *Urkundenbuch*, I., 263; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, p. 54, 57, 59. C. R. II., 106.

‡Schirrmacher, 61, 482; C. R. II., 111.

§See these papers in *Urkundenbuch*, I., 283 et seq.; Schirrmacher, 64; C. R. II., 110.

ports of this day we hear nothing about the Confession. Everybody was busy with other matters. See the letter of the Nuremberg delegates, June 16th (C. R. II., 106-7). June 17th. In the morning the princes presented their reasons to the Emperor for not interdicting preaching.* Adam Weiss preached before the Elector, and John Rurer under instruction from Margrave George preached in the church of St. Catharine.† In the afternoon Melancthon had a conference with the imperial secretaries, Schlepper and Valdesius. Here he declared that the difference between the Protestants and the Catholics has reference chiefly to Priestly Celibacy, Private Mass and Communion in both kinds.‡

June 18th. The Protestant Princes assembled at the *Rathhaus* in the forenoon to hear the imperial decision in regard to preaching. They made reply, and at first refused obedience. It was finally agreed that preaching should cease on both sides.§ Adam Weiss preached before the Elector.|| Melancthon had another interview with Valdesius. It was proposed to settle the dissension without having the Confession read. Melancthon promised to consider the matter.¶ In the evening the royal interdict of preaching was proclaimed.

We thus see that for three days the princes were occupied almost exclusively with the matter of the preaching. Hence Melancthon could write: "This matter was in dispute three entire days;"—"This matter was then in dispute three days;"—"At once he (the Emperor) forbade ours to preach. As they did not immediately obey, the dispute lasted three days."** The theologians were occupied in preparing *Bedenken*, in preaching and in holding interviews. He who looks at the documents which were prepared during these three days as given by Förstemann and Schirrmacher, simply wonders that so much could

*Schirrmacher, 66, 483; Förstemann, I., 283-290.

†Schirr., 483, Urk., 268; Pfeilschmidt, 55, Müller, 545.

‡Schmidt, *Philipp Melancthon*, p. 195. C. R. II., 122.

§Schirr., 58 et seq., Pfeilschmidt, 55.

||Urk., I., 268; Schirr., 484.

¶Schmidt, 196.

**C. R. II., 117, 118. *Letters* by Bindseil, 61.

have been transacted. And yet in all these documents and contemporaneous reports, including the two letters of the Nuremberg delegates of the 16th, we have not found a word about the Confession. Indeed we know positively, that work on the Confession was suspended, and that it was in danger of being abandoned.*

June 19th the Nuremberg delegates wrote: "Yesterday before breakfast your two latest letters were answered by us. Then we went first to our Gracious Lord the Margrave, and afterwards to our Gracious Lord the Elector. In both places we find that his Electoral and his Princely Grace, learn with pleasure that your Excellencies will unite with their Princely Graces. They also graciously declare that in this matter they will associate you with themselves, and allow the affairs of his Electoral and his Princely Grace and of your Excellencies to go together. And though Margrave George, with his answer and promise, was clearer and franker than the Saxon, yet we do not anticipate any failure on the part of the Saxon." They go on to say that the Epilogue is not yet prepared, and that Melanchthon is contemplating a briefer statement; and they promise further information.†

This letter shows an advance in concert of action; but (*a*) such action is not yet consummated, (*b*) at present it contemplates only the two princes mentioned and Nuremberg, (*c*) there is still an element of uncertainty in the Elector, (*d*) the Confession is not yet complete, (*e*) Melanchthon is uncertain about the future of the Confession. Only partially then and contingently has the Confession, which is still called "the Confession of his Electoral Grace," become a common document. Dr. Krauth has ignored that part of the letter quoted above. We do not

*Schmidt, 196; C. R. XXVI., 209, 210; C. R. II., 112. Also Kolde in *Real-Encyc.* 249.

It is passing strange that Dr. Krauth should ignore absolutely the transactions of June 17th and 18th. Perhaps he did it because he found no allusion during these days to the Confession, as certainly he found none and no record of any transactions about the Confession, on 16th. *Lutheran Monographs*, p. 41.

†C. R. II., 112.

hesitate to say that this letter alone is fatal to his theory noticed below.

In the afternoon of this day all the princes assembled at the palace and settled some of their disputes. Melanchthon wrote several letters, and Brentz a long one to Isenmann. None of the documents speak of any action on the Confession on that day, which was Sunday.

June 20th. The Elector and the princes go to the palace at seven o'clock, A. M. The Elector carries the sword before the Emperor at Mass. Pimpinelli delivers a long oration in Latin. The Diet is formally opened at the *Rathhaus*. The Imperial Proposition about Religion, requiring the Electors, Princes and Estates to exhibit their doctrines and grievances in German and Latin, is delivered. The session lasts till one o'clock P. M. In the evening the Elector assembles his allies in religion at his own residence, and exhorts them to steadfastness.*

June 21st. In the morning the Elector gives himself to prayer and reading the Psalms. Later he calls his son, Brück and Melanchthon, and talks confidentially over the affairs of religion with them. He declares that "he will make no declaration without the consent and counsel of those allied with them in religion."† At two o'clock he calls the Estates together, has the Imperial Proposition read, and requests each one to give his opinion the next day.‡ The Nurenberg delegates write a long letter to their senate, finishing it at 5 o'clock P. M. They then add the following "Postscript": "After we had finished this letter, I, Kress, was called to the Elector's residence. His Electoral Grace, Margrave George, and the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneberg were there. In the presence of the Elector and of Margrave George, they declare simply, that, inasmuch as the Elector has already prepared a confession of faith, a copy of which your Excellencies have received, they, through us, have offered to join the Elector. At this time they are holding a

*See Schirrm., 73 et seq; C. R. II., 122; Coelestin, I., 105-121; Müller,

†Coelestin, II., 122; Müller, 568.

‡Coelestin, I., 122^b; Müller, 568.

session over the articles, and are further revising, stating and finishing them. It is the desire also of the Princes that your Excellencies should immediately send your preachers, or whom you will, but especially *Osiander*, and would instruct them to help us to consider and deliberate over these articles, and whatever is needed in the transaction."*

This "Postscript," which also has been *ignored* by Dr. Krauth in his *Chronicle*, makes it as clear as day, that not until this hour, had it been agreed to make the Saxon Confession the common Confession of all the Evangelical Princes. It is distinctly announced by the representatives of Hesse and Lüneburg, that they have joined the Saxon, inasmuch as he has already prepared a confession. It is altogether probable that they are brought to this conclusion now rather hurriedly, because of the Imperial Proposition which demanded a confession in Latin and German from each one, and because of the violence shown by their enemies at the opening of the Diet.† The Confession is now undergoing revision as a *common document*. The Nurembergers are officially asked to take part. A common faith, a common danger and a common requisition unite the Protestants in a common Confession.

The next day (June 22nd) the Protestants are notified to present their Confession on June 24th. Salig says the theologians worked night and day, and the Nuremberg delegates tell us: "Last Thursday (23rd) early we and the delegate from Reutlingen were summoned before the Saxon, the Hessian, Margrave George and Lüneburg. There, in the presence of all their princely graces, their counsellors, and theologians, of whom there were twelve, besides other scholars and doctors, the aforesaid Confession was read over, examined and considered in order to present the same yesterday afternoon to his Imperial Majesty."‡ It is an undisputed fact that the text of the Augsburg Confession was officially fixed (though Melanchthon continued to make verbal changes), and, in all probability, signed

*C. R. II., 124.

†Plitt, II., 533.

‡C. R. II., 127.

at this time. It is henceforth the Augsburg Confession of History. The Protestants failed to get a hearing, June 24th, but the day following, the Confession was read before the Emperor and the assembled Princes in the small chapel of the Episcopal palace. The two copies, Latin and German, were handed to the Emperor, who gave the German to the Elector of Mayence for preservation in the imperial archives, and kept the Latin in his own hands. Both copies are lost.

Bringing together the chief facts connected with the composition of the Confession, we find:

1. The Confession in its *first draft* was sent to Luther May 11th, and returned with his approval. Eleven days later Melancthon asks Luther "to run over the articles of faith," but determines to treat the rest *utcumque*. There is absolutely no proof, nor even a valid reason for believing that the Confession, or a part of it, was sent to Luther a *second time*. There is not a line of contemporaneous evidence to show that Luther was consulted in regard to the Confession or any part of it from May 22nd till after June 25th. In this long interval, by the advice and assistance of the theologians and the civil counselors, Melancthon was bringing the Confession into its final shape.

2. The theory promulgated some years ago by the late Dr. C. P. Krauth,* that some time after June 14th the Confession in "its final form," "in the presence of the Princes and other officials, and of the preachers, was discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," and then sent to Luther a *third time*, and received back again with his approval, and *after this* delivered to the Emperor—this theory is not sustained by a single syllable of the abundant literature in the form of official letters and documents of those eventful days, nor by the private letters of the same period. We have seen that every available hour of time for the eight or ten days next after June 14th, was occupied in other business. There are over four hundred sentences in the Confession. Allowing the ab-

**Lutheran Monographs*, p. 61; *Conserv. Reformation*, 232-3.

surdly short time of ten minutes to "discuss and determine upon" each sentence, more than sixty-six hours would be required. It is absolutely impossible to find so many hours in that period (June 14th-24th), not otherwise occupied. Besides, the four letters of the Nurenberg delegates (June 8th, 16th, 19th, 21st) which show the beginning, progress and consummation of the idea of unity of presentation, but which Dr. Krauth has ignored in the way indicated above, make it absolutely certain that no such *discussion and determining upon* as the theory asserts, could have taken place until after 5 o'clock, June 21st, as not until after that hour did "it (the Confession) ripen into the absolute unity of presentation known as the Augsburg Confession."* Prior to this time it was still the *Saxon Confession*, as the documents show, and now, as it required eight days to go from Augsburg to Coburg and back, the time is too short. The Confession is finally revised, June 23rd and presented, June 25th. Moreover, Melanchthon, in two lengthy accounts given by him of the composition of the Confession, speaks of only *one* sending to Luther.† In the account written in German, Luther's approbation of the Confession is made to occur *prior* to the careful examination of all the articles by the Princes and others. In the account written in Latin, the reverse is the order. If there be a contradiction between the accounts, the contradiction does not affect the number of the times the Confession was sent, but the order of events. *In either case only one sending is noted.* We know that sending occurred May 11th. The order of events is secondary. Two things Melanchthon means to affirm: (1) That the Confession was sent to Luther and received his approbation; (2) that it was carefully examined by the Princes *et al.* The documents show when it was sent to and approved by Luther, and that it was examined by the Princes *et al.* Thus what the documents exhibit Melanchthon affirms. The chain of evidence is complete.

June 56th Melanchthon wrote to Luther *inter alia*: "Our defense (Confession) has been presented to the Emperor. I

**Luth. Monographs*, p. 31.

†C. R. IX., 929, 1051 et seqq.

send it to you to read." The next day he wrote to Veit Dietrich who was with Luther and says: "Write me back the Doctor's opinion of it," and again after three days to the same: "I would like to know whether the Doctor is in a better humor, and what he thinks of the Apology."* There would be no sense in sending Luther the Confession "to read," and of inquiring for his opinion, if only a few days before, he had read the Confession in its "final form," and had expressed his approbation of it. Barring one slight allusion, which cannot be understood from the context, Dr. Krauth has ignored the parts of these three letters translated above, and yet they belong to the *chronicle* of the Augsburg Confession. Certainly they do not favor his theory.

For a masterly criticism of Dr. Krauth's translation of Latin, and for an unanswered and unanswerable refutation of his *theory* of a *third sending*, the reader is referred to the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., 1878, p. 621 et seqq. A theory so utterly destitute of historical validity, and so chronologically impossible, would not have been noticed here, but for the fact that many persons who do not have access to the sources of information continue in their innocence to perpetuate the vain delusion. Those who would know all the facts about the Augsburg Confession and the transactions of the Evangelicals from June 14th to June 25th, must look to the original contemporaneous documents found in Vols. II. and XXVI., *Corpus Reformatorum*, in Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, and in Vol. I., of Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, and not to "A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession," pp. 40-46, by Dr. Krauth, who omits more, and in some particulars *more important* matters, than he includes in his *Chronicle*.

See C. R. II., 141, 147, 158.

ARTICLE II.

CHRISTIAN BURIAL.

BY GEORGE U. WENNER, D. D.

There is a close relation between dogma and liturgy. The present condition of the Protestant funeral service is an example. Our Office for the Dead is an incomplete structure. Even among ministers there is considerable disagreement on such simple questions as the subject, the object and the mode of Christian burial. Among all the services we are called on to render in our ministry that of the funeral is probably the least satisfactory.

Our doctrine concerning death and the hereafter has had but a meagre development, and hence our practice in relation to the dead moves on a somewhat uncertain plane. The very name Protestant implies negation, and in the field of eschatology particularly we are more famous for declaring what we do not believe than what we do believe. Our church orders are particular in declaring what should not be done, but comparatively backward in constructing a positive system to take the place of the rejected one.

The early church had little trouble in its thought about the hereafter or in construing its relations to the departed. Their brethren who had died in Christ had gone to be with Jesus, but the mutual relation that had existed between them was not severed by death. Even the natural heart knows that love cannot die. And if we may love them, why may they not also love us? The accompanying sentiment of Charles Kingsley represents the common thought of the early church: "Love is not dead. It lives still in the next world for you, and perhaps with you. For why should not those who are gone, if they are gone to their Lord, be actually nearer us, not farther from us, in the heavenly world?" But in addition to this they knew what the natural man did not know, that the Church of Christ was but

one body. "Part of the host have crossed the flood, and part are crossing now." This was enough to establish a mutual relation, and to afford a basis for prayers for the dead and by the dead. If the dead brother was a martyr or saint, one comparatively rich therefore in spiritual gifts, his mediation and prayers would naturally be sought by the living. If on the other hand he was poor in spiritual treasure, why should not the living seek to help him with their prayers? Even such a clear thinker as St. Augustine never for a moment supposed that there was anything wrong in such conceptions. When doubt was first cast upon it, unfortunately it came from a heretical quarter, the church was paralyzed with horror, nor did it deem the suggestion worthy of a reply.

But in course of time the mediatorial office of Christ was overlooked and the mediation of saints took its place. Furthermore, the church undertook to provide for the salvation of the departed with the same confidence as for the living. Hence in the Roman Catholic system, death marks the beginning of an entirely new series of services and efforts on the part of the church in behalf of the dead.

The Reformation began in the domain of soteriology, and yet it was an eschatological question, the state of souls in purgatory, and in view thereof the rule of indulgences, that became one of the immediate occasions of the movement. *The* question of the Reformation was, "What must I do to be saved?" The answer was: "In repentance and faith accept the finished work of the only Mediator." With this searchlight the whole system of existing customs and opinions was illuminated, and men were able to see with perfect clearness what was wrong in the old teaching. Two things particularly were made clear by her central doctrines. One was that if a man died in Christ, in a state of justification, he was saved and had no further need of the prayers and the work of the church. The other was that we have no Scriptural authority for endeavoring to promote the salvation of the departed, on the other hand the present life is declared to be our only state of probation. With such a doctrine there was no room for most of the funeral practices of the ante-reforma-

tion church, and the pruning knife was therefore relentlessly applied. But there has been a development of dogma since that time. One of the most important periods, as affecting our subject, was that of Rationalism. Its influence was of a far-reaching character. Rationalism had no use for the text "The wages of sin is death," or for the doctrine that life is a probation which ends in death. Having no faith in the resurrection and no fear of the judgment, its funeral addresses were limited to sentimental commonplaces, or to expressions of sweet sympathy with the friends and of respect for the remains of the departed. Worse than all, it preached a new gospel of redemption, for death made angels of us all, and all a man had to do in order to get to heaven was to die. We are living in another period it is true, but I am not sure that the echoes of that system do not still linger among us.

I propose to offer some thoughts on the subject of the Christian Burial Service. But before doing so, there are two preliminary questions connected with our subject. The first of these is, Upon whom does the duty of Christian burial devolve? Is it a family matter, the duty of the nearest kin? Or has the church a duty in relation to it? The oldest Christian burial service of which we have any knowledge is described by Tertullian, in the second century. When any one died, the ministers and congregation were called together and a public service was held, in all respects as at other times except that in the act of oblation, the general prayer that preceded the communion, mention was made of the deceased and thanksgiving and intercession were offered in his behalf. At the same time offerings were brought for the poor and for widows and orphans. This was before the introduction of distinctively Roman Catholic errors and has nothing to do with the questions involved therein. The point to be noted is that it was a church service, and not a private affair.

The Reformation maintained the same principle, that an honorable burial was a church burial. It was preceded by the tolling of the bells to call the people together, and included singing, prayer, a funeral sermon and the benediction. In call-

ing it a church funeral, we do not mean that it necessarily was held in the church building. It was a funeral conducted by the Christian congregation and by the minister in its name.

The reason for this seems to have been a desire on the part of the church to manifest the fellowship of believers both of the living and of the dead. It was also an opportunity to give emphatic expression to the church's doctrine of the resurrection.

This practice of the Christian centuries still finds wide recognition. The feeling prevails that to save a funeral from being *non honestus*, a minister must be called in to officiate at the ceremonies. This is entirely apart from the question whether the deceased was a communicant or not.

It may be asked here whether other than Christian ceremonies may be allowed at a funeral service. If the minister has simply been hired for the occasion, to supplement, as it were, the arrangements of the undertaker, it is not a serious question. But if he is there in his representative capacity, as a minister of the church, it is a question. I once heard a bishop make a speech at a burial in which no allusion was made to Jesus and the resurrection. All I can remember is that he said something about the Great Architect and the Everlasting East, and then some men with white aprons on them walked around and threw pieces of evergreen into the grave.

The second preliminary question that occurs to us is: "Who are proper objects of Christian burial." A general answer to this question is that only Christians are entitled to it. The church of Rome extends the prohibition to unbaptized infants. So also does the Church of England.* The Lutheran Church† on the other hand does not exclude the unbaptized children of Christian parents on the ground that our salvation does not depend on baptism, and that it is not the omission of the sacrament, but the contempt thereof that condemns.

The canon law also denied Christian burial to the excommu-

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in America does not.

†Or rather Lutheran teaching, for among Lutherans we emphasize rather the doctrine which is accepted in certain churches known as Lutheran than the doctrine of a body known as the Church.

nicate, to suicides, to those who had fallen in duel, to usurers, robbers, incendiaries, to violators of churches, to such as had failed to commune during the past year, to well-known blasphemers, to apostates, to schismatics and to heretics.

The Church of England denies it only to the unbaptized, the excommunicate and to suicides. In the case of dissenters it has been decided that the clergyman may omit the service if the friends of the deceased desire it. "In cases of notorious wickedness or infidelity a clergyman may omit the office, but he must be prepared to abide the consequences. But it is held in the majority of cases even where the life has been notoriously evil, that the sinner has not been utterly forsaken by God's mercy in his death. In Lancashire Roman Catholics have constantly been buried without any service in the church or churchyard; while on the other hand at the burial of Robert Owen, and of a notorious infidel, the clergymen thought it their duty to say the service, in the face of a strong protest against its use on the part of the relatives."*

The Lutheran practice denies Christian burial to the excommunicate, to suicides,† to open despisers of the divine word and sacraments, to those who have died under conviction of a capital crime, and to those who have fallen in the duel. According to Lutheran practice the bodies of Heathen, Turks, Jews and Socinians may not be interred in God's acre. On the other hand Romanists and the adherents of the Reformed faith, are not excluded. But in Electoral Saxony it was prescribed that the funeral of Catholics and Calvinists must be conducted privately and with the omission of the usual ceremonies. The Liturgy of the Reformed Dutch Church, 1854, contains no burial service. In regard to the practice of the various dissenting branches of the English Church I have not been able to learn the exact principle which governs them. Their services seem to be largely eclectic and they borrow freely from the Protestant Episcopal liturgy.

After this preliminary glance at the proper subject and the

*See Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*.

†Unless irresponsible at the time the act was committed.

proper object of Christian burial we will consider the mode of conducting it. According to the Lutheran view a funeral properly consisted of two parts, first the Procession and secondly the Service. To the Procession belonged the tolling of the bell, the presence of the congregation, the presence of the minister and school, the singing of hymns and the burial.

The bell was tolled not merely to advise the people of the hour of the funeral, but also as a *memento mori*. The presence of the congregation was regarded as a Christian duty and a work of love, and ministers were constantly instructed to impress upon their people the importance of this duty not only in the case of the rich but especially in the case of the poor.

The use of processional hymns is very ancient and was gladly adopted by the Church which was distinguished for taking a new flight in Christian song.

Some of the famous Latin hymns were the *Dies irae*, *Vexilla regis* and Notker's *media vita*. The last named is used in prose form in the English service and in that form has of course lost most of its beauty and impressiveness. In its German form by Luther, *Mitten wir im Leben sind mit dem Tod umfassen*, it has an indescribable majesty and solemnity.* The *Vexilla regis* dates from the sixth century and is derived from the beautiful custom of carrying a large cross at the head of the funeral procession. I cannot forbear quoting a few stanzas from Neale's translation :

"The royal banners forward go, The cross shines forth in mystic glow;
Where He in flesh, our flesh who made, Our sentence bore, our ransom paid.
Upon its arms like balance true, He weighed the price for sinners due,
The price which none but He could pay, And spoiled the spoiler of his prey."

Besides these translations from the Latin there are a number of classic German hymns.

The committal service among Protestants is peculiar to the Anglicans. It is derived from the Roman Catholics who in

*"In the Middle Ages it was adopted as a dirge on all melancholy occasions in Germany; armies used it as a battle song; and superstitious ideas of its miraculous power rose to such a height, that in the year 1316 the Synod of Cologne forbade the people to sing it at all except on such occasions as were allowed by their bishop." Blunt, p. 480.

turn may have borrowed the symbolism from the ancient Romans. A reference to the custom is found in one of the odes of Horace. In the Greek Church the priest casts earth on the body saying: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the compass of the round world, and they that dwell therein." From the English book it found its way into many modern rituals, into Germany by way of Prussia in 1822. It is an expression of the feeling that some formality should be observed, some symbolical act performed. Under Puritan influence it has undergone many changes, and it is still open to serious question. Our own orders prescribe no ceremony; but the order of Ott Heinrich, 1547, suggests the following: After the Hymn the Antiphon "I am the resurrection and the life" may be used, or "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again." And after the casket has been lowered into the grave the minister shall say: "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," &c.

Immediately after the procession the service was held, that is an act of preaching and prayer. While there was no uniformity in the orders of the various countries, the following were the essential constituents of the service: The Lessons, the Sermon and the Prayers. The lessons were John 11, 1 Cor. 15: 20 to 26, 1 Thess. 4, and Job 19. For the funeral of a young man Luke 7, and for that of a young girl Matt. 9. Besides it was prescribed that the funeral texts should be read distinctly from *the book*, naming the chapter.* The Protestant Episcopal Church has but one lesson of 39 verses, which is in quantity too much, and in scope too little. On the other hand the practice of many ministers of selecting short passages from all parts of the Scripture, having more or less bearing on the subject, frequently curtailing the texts themselves in order to make them fit, is unchurchly and reprehensible.

The sermon is the *cruz* of the funeral service in our day. Not everyone has the boldness of the Methodist preacher who when called upon to officiate at the funeral of a man of doubtful career, simply said: "Good I cannot say of him, bad I dare not say of him. Take him up and bury him;" or the commanding

*See Kliefoth, p. 142.

dignity of Dr. Adams at the funeral of Rufus Choate. After recounting the eminent gifts and services of the deceased, he closed by saying: "On the subject of his regeneration, I have nothing to say."

Although it was recognized that the funeral sermon involved a severe tax upon the minister's time, it was considered a duty that should not be omitted. When God visits men, the sermon will touch the heart more than at other times. It was permissible to make mention of the deceased in the sermon, what he had been to his church and to his family. If any one had occupied a high station and had conducted himself therein in an upright and Christian manner, account might be made of it to the praise of God, only it must be done in a moderate and God-fearing manner. In latter times rationalism produced panegyrics that were a disgrace to the pulpit, but the church was not to blame for that. The object of the sermon was to teach, to console, to admonish. The themes that were to be treated were such as, "The wages of sin is death;" "the uncertainty of life, but the certainty of the redemption of Christ;" that he that keepeth his word shall not see death; the resurrection of the dead and the glory and joy of the everlasting life; and how every Christian should prepare himself for a blessed departure from this life. These it will be observed are very old-fashioned themes.

In order to avoid a disagreeable responsibility, there has been a disposition in certain quarters to omit the sermon, and simply to read the service. The question is sometimes asked whether a funeral sermon ever converted anybody. Many sermons probably are not constructed for that purpose. And it does almost seem like taking an unfair advantage of the mourners, to preach at them in the hour of their deep sorrow. But on the other hand, the messenger of God must not be unmindful of his office and duty.

It may be a superfluous question whether the prayers should contain intercession for the dead. Nevertheless it is not altogether uncalled for. The impulse to pray for the departed is one that lies very close to the human heart. And history is

altogether in its favor. In Tertullian's time the practice had been in existence from time immemorial. Luther answers the question in this way: "As the Scripture says nothing about it, I do not regard it a sin if in your own secret prayer you offer some such petition as this: 'Dear God, if the soul is in such a state as that help may still be given, be gracious,' &c. And when you have done this once or twice, let that be sufficient."

The dogmaticians took up the question with the result that all petitions or forms of prayer for the dead are excluded from the public service. While secret prayer for the dead is not forbidden, public prayer, other than thanksgiving is expressly forbidden.

The first prayer of the Anglican book is now free from that element, but it is a redaction of a prayer that distinctly included intercession for the dead.

It is a growing custom in the Episcopal Church to celebrate the communion in connection with a funeral. The relation of this celebration to the masses for the dead and the remembrance of the horrible abuses connected therewith, renders it unnecessary to consider the question from a Protestant standpoint.

There are two customs in our Church which I venture to mention as not being in conflict with evangelical doctrine and as serving to edification.

The first is the parentation or thanksgiving. On the Sunday following the funeral mention is made of the departed at the church service, thanks are returned to God for the blessings he has bestowed, and intercession is made on behalf of the family and friends some such form as follows may be observed: "It has pleased God to call away from this world our brother * * in the * * year of his age. And the content of the prayer might be something like this: We give thanks unto thee our heavenly Father for all the blessings which thou hast bestowed upon our brother in this life. We beseech thee to visit with the consolations of thy word the hearts of all who have been bereaved. Teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom. Help us to look for the blessed appearing of thy Son

Jesus Christ and bring us at last to the company of thy saints, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Such a service it seems to me would mightily strengthen among our people the feeling of fellowship and would be a tender and loving service for the family. Another custom which I would recommend is the observance of a memorial Sunday. In place of All Saints' Day, to which some doctrinal exception might be taken, we observe the last Sunday of the Church Year as a memorial Sunday. The entire service is indeed a funeral service in memory of the departed of the year. Some of our strict churchmen suspect that it contains the leaven of Romanism, but it is now almost universal in Germany. I have found it to be very edifying and it unquestionably responds to a craving of the heart.

I end as I began with a feeling that our funeral service is an imperfect relic. We may prune a little here and restore a little there, but what we need is an original structure, along historical lines, but nevertheless on the basis of clearly defined Protestant doctrine. But as to the spirit of the service we shall doubtless all agree. It is no place for sentimental sympathy, for lugubrious rhetoric, or for idolatrous adulation. On the one hand it should be pervaded with the solemnity of God's judgment. But on the other hand it should lift us up to the glory of the resurrection, and to the joy of Paradise "where they that loved are blest, where loyal hearts and true stand ever in the light, All rapture through and through, In God's most holy sight."

ARTICLE III.

THE PREACHING FOR A THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

[INAUGURAL ADDRESS AS PROFESSOR IN WITTENBERG THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY, SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.]

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

Mr. President, Members of the Board of Directors, Fathers and Brethren:

In the charge just given by the President of the Board of Directors you have been gratified and I have been encouraged as well as admonished. If this service had no other object it might now very properly be brought to a close; but the law of custom which imposes upon me the task upon which I now enter, doubtless has its foundation in good reason and does not merely aim at meeting a conventional propriety. He who occupies the part of instructor in a theological school does not discharge his important functions before the public, and yet he is in some sense responsible to the people, and as such it is fitting that once at least, in entering upon his charge, the public should know in what spirit his work is to be done. Before announcing the subject of the address, you will indulge a word that is personal, inasmuch as in a peculiar sense I enter upon the duties of a new work, after years of happy pastoral experience, with the twofold inspiration of responsibility and gratitude. I am to succeed in the chair of Practical Theology a personal friend; a man whose Christian virtues, large experience, fidelity to his Church in trying circumstances, valuable and long-continued services, led us to hope for yet some years of service in this chair, had not the Head of the Church, to whose ways though inscrutable we must humbly bow, ordered otherwise. More than this, my professorship is the fitting memorial in our "school of the prophets," and in the Church of his affection and service of one of the church's most widely known and useful layman, who is not because God hath taken him; a man whose nobility of character and devotion to his Church and the

Church's Lord, have left an abiding impress among such as knew and honored him when living. It will also be admitted to be a rare felicity, that, in accordance with the conditions of the foundation of this professorship, I was nominated to this important function, and that without solicitation or intimation, on my part, by one who knew me as pastor and preacher. I desire accordingly in these introductory remarks to express in this public way my high appreciation of the honor thus conferred upon me by the noble Christian woman, who has honored Christian stewardship in the benefaction which has made this work and position possible, in our cherished school for ministerial training.

Having taken the obligation wisely required by the Board of Directors of its theological teachers, and in view of the history of our seminary in recent years, I desire, on this occasion, to reiterate with the emphasis of reassertion, my entire accord with that part of the doctrinal basis upon which our schools rests, and which has been declared by our General Synod to be "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that word." With an earnest desire not to be misunderstood or misinterpreted, I come to declare that that I accept, hold and teach *ex animo*, as my doctrinal basis, and that with the governing principles, the history, spirit and life of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as that body has interpreted itself, and with a hearty belief in its peculiar mission among the religious bodies of this country, I find myself in increasing and affectionate sympathy, as well as in hearty and fraternal accord with my honored and able teachers and colleagues.

Called to be henceforth occupied with the subject of preaching, that chief lever of an evangelical ministry, I have desired to discuss some theme not purely in the abstract, but in its practical relations. As congenial with existing tendencies of thought, and as pertinent to the duties of my professorship and this occasion, I shall invite your further attention to a theme of which this is the most general expression—"The preaching for a theological crisis."

THE PREACHING FOR A THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

Each age has its own theological work to do. Whatever truth there may be in that, frequently unexpressed, expectation that as the world grows old and the coming of the Lord draws nearer, there will be some conflict between truth and error, greater perhaps than has ever been known before, this certainly is true that each age of the Church must expect its own difficulties and face its own problems. The history of the Church tells us how that error has assumed its own peculiar form in each century. We cannot live entirely on the inheritance of the past even if we would. We must make it our own, by enriching it by the fruits of our own exertions and vigorously maintaining its permanent elements. We can easily characterize the larger movements in Christian Theology which have constituted epochs by comparing their respective proportion of subjective and objective. We may justly classify Mysticism, Pietism, and Idealism as excessively subjective, while Rationalism and Skepticism are exclusively so. The arid periods in religious thought have been those in which efforts have been made to fuse the contents of revelation into harmony with the thinking, feeling and life of their respective ages, and subordinating at the same time such elements of the truth, as are perfect and unchangeable, because divine in their origin. What is to be desired, manifestly, is the just proportion of objective and subjective in the measure of their legitimate importance. There is an actual objective relation to which we must look for our religion and theology, as there is an actual world of matter to which we must look for our natural sciences. The source of our knowledge is Christianity, and it is Christianity concerning which we are to gain some knowledge. That Christianity is a real history wrought out in events which have unquestionably occurred and which are component parts of earthly history, while back of this history and expressing themselves through it are certain immutable doctrines and principles of truth. It is one of the clear gains of modern religious thought that we rest back upon a solid basis of facts, which basis rests in turn upon solid, essential principles which are immutably true, and which have been wrested from cotem-

porary error in some of the great conflicts which have been waged for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

The ancient Greek Church, for example, is the mother of œcumenical orthodoxy. She elaborated in the great councils of the Church the fundamental dogmas of the Trinity and the Person of Christ as those dogmas are stated in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. The Latin Church devoted her strength to the problems of anthropology and her splendid contribution to religious thought and progress is the Augustinian theology, with its profound views and experiences of sin and grace. The schoolmen of the Middle Ages formalized, analyzed and systematized the doctrines of the fathers and showed the harmony of revelation and reason. The Mystics of the same period, placing the emphasis upon the subject who receives the objective revelation, insisted on a theology of the heart and an inward spiritual experience. With the Reformation was born evangelical theology, from the fresh fountain of the Scriptures, and in heroic conflict with the errors of Romanism. We find its germs in the struggles of conscience and the resulting action of a German monk. It dealt with the basis of all religion—the relation of man to God and the duties depending upon that relation. Since that time soteriology and the subjective side of Christianity in its bearing upon the character and comfort of the individual believer have received more attention than ever before. The Wesleyan movement in the last century largely dealt with recalling men from the limitations put upon the divine purpose by some aspects of the Latin theology. A great scholar of Germany has recently expressed the belief that questions of ecclesiology and eschatology will come last and next in the order of religious problems. Whether or not his forecast may be correct, certain we are of this, that the burning questions just now are Christology in its historical aspects and Bibliology in its relation to modern criticism and scientific methods and discoveries. The theological problems peculiar to our times centre in the two last named subjects. Their discussion has largely partaken of the characteristic spirit of the age, which is largely given to the exaltation of purely utilitarian interests. The age spirit reminds one of the olden times when a wild war of errors

was contending for the mastery and the equipoise of truth was singularly lacking. Modern theological thought is not one thing but many, and presents a wide field of energetic, varied and somewhat antagonistic movements. It is subject to many influences. It is affected by the progress—the natural progress, of the various subordinate parts of the one “Queen of the sciences,” which are, as it were, the tools with which theology works. It has benefited by improved methods of exegesis, and by the increasing agreement about the principles according to which the sense of Scripture should be elicited. The prosecution of the work of biblical theology, as a distinct department, has done much both to clear and enrich theological thought. A very sensible effect likewise has been produced by the study of historical theology. The calm, comparative survey of the work of different schools of thinkers, the curious dissection of each competing system, with a view to assign the theological motive to each—such studies have produced a mental attitude toward controversies distinctly different from that which once obtained. New modes of centering theological thought, new assignments of the axis on which it should revolve modify from time to time the cast of prevailing conceptions. It is not possible that the pursuit of even these lofty themes should be prosecuted uninfluenced by the age spirit, and accordingly they have been engaged in with a full dependence on the power of truth and a readiness to court the freest investigation. They have been pursued in the face of a state of mind, both within and without the Church, which is impatient of closed questions. Men may be conscious of the fact that they are not infallible; but in our day they are especially prone to doubt whether former times were more so than these. What right, they are asking, had early ages to close up the greatest questions pertaining to God and to man? The old creeds are noble monuments of Christian thought and feeling, say they; but are they certainly true because they are old? Did the Nicene Council really know more than we about the *Θεός ἐν Θεοῦ*; *Φῶς ἐν Φωτός*? That the language may be noble and true, venerable and sublime, is not the question. The question is: is it certainly true because *they* said it? Is there any point in what we may call the precipita-

tion or crystallization of doctrine at which it passes out of the region of inquiry, and enters that of final and ascertained truth, so as to become a part of universal orthodoxy or right belief? Long ago Lord Bacon showed us that we are the true ancients who live in the mature age of the world, whereas our fathers lived in infancy. Accordingly men are saying that we have access to all the light our fathers had as well as to all that has been accumulated since their time, and ask the privilege and claim the right of judging for themselves. Such language and such sentiments as these, applied to the great problems of Christian theology, are not entirely bad, and are even safe with proper restrictions. But it is possible to use such language, to express such sentiments, in a spirit of mere flippant irreverence for the conclusions of men immeasurably nobler and larger than those who thus talk. There is a questioning which is not a search for truth, but rather an ostentatious display of one of the cheapest and most childish qualities of the mind, viz.: intellectual pertness.

Men are saying too in our times that the law of progress be allowed to hold true in theology as in other departments of thought. Unquestionably knowledge is growing and growing very rapidly. There is no department of human inquiry of which that is not true. The literatures of the past are ransacked and languages are studied with more thorough and critical methods. The primitive forms of society, early civilization, and uncivilization, manners and want of manners, customs that are barbarous and customs that are venerable are all brought to the surface and keenly studied, with a view to finding out whether human society, follows any law of growth, and if so, what that law is. The same is true—still more emphatically true—of outward nature. Our knowledge of natural science is expanding every day. Chemistry, geology, botany, the theories of heat, of electricity, of magnetism, are passing constantly into new forms. Men who have reached middle life have had to unlearn and learn again a great deal of the physical science of college days. This is not a matter for sorrow. It is well that the human mind should be kept in movement, and that it should make every fragment of new knowledge an instrument of further progress.

But the pursuit of theological studies, in a time such as this especially, is liable to false progress as well as true. Foolish men sometimes think they are getting forward when they are only gyrating about in mere childish restlessness and impatience of established beliefs. We would not stay or check or turn from its course by any priestly incantations, or prophetic denunciations, or parliamentary edicts the intense intellectual activity of to-day. We may be shocked at times by what seems to us to be its audacity and irreverence in disregarding what we may consider sacred and authentic, nevertheless we want no chamber of torture, no new Index Expurgatorius. Truth is capable of its own vindication. We wish the doubter to speak out his doubt without disguise and without fear of hindrance. We shall then know where the defences of truth are weak, and what evidence is yet to be supplied or supplemented. It is not our office to invoke fire from heaven upon all who do not follow with us. Drifts of thought cannot be stopped or changed by dams and breakwaters of mechanical appliances of any kind, but only by counter drifts of higher origin and stronger current. Only this precaution would I utter regarding distinctively theological pursuits and truth, that there are some things in this world to be credited with the attribute of stability—some things that modern thought in its effective currents, the resultant trend of its great movements, and the mighty undertow that is bearing our institutions of society and possibly our whole civilization toward some new center, has left untouched and unchanged because they are unchangeable.

Men will never be cured of believing too little by unscrupulous attempts to involve them in believing too much, but in a time like ours they are very liable to wander into the vague and doubtful ways through unauthorized claims in behalf of alleged progress and thought neither of which is either progressive or thoughtful. I do not fear that either an atheistical agnosticism, a dogmatic atheism or a perverted and nerveless liberalism, is destined to establish itself upon the ruins of the Church of Christ. The danger is not on that line but rather in this, that before such systems are smitten by the sword of sound argu-

ment and ignominiously driven forth by the revolt against them of man's higher feelings, they may do much harm to unstable souls.

In such a time unbelief is likely to take on the forms of fadism. Shallow people fall to casting doubt on established truths and call it intellectual superiority. Rejecting the historic religion of the inspired Scriptures, the incarnation, the atonement the resurrection, they are prepared to adopt every notion that comes along—theosophy, hypnotism, thought-force, faith-cure, mind-cure, divine-healing, Christian science, and other religious vagaries—or they will presume to do the impossible task of nominally holding on to their Christian profession, but explaining away the accepted meaning of fundamental doctrines, emptying revealed truths of all their power, and so of all their practical value, invariably making their religion subservient to their accepted theory, and finally standing for St. Paul's portrayal in his warning to Timothy: "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned unto fables."

Popular skepticism is a very multifarious and wholesale thing. Ours is an age of secular doubt, and doubtless the Church has felt more deeply than it has yet confessed the age pervading chill of a winter of doubt and discontent. If I were called to characterize the age in much of its thinking I should say, that it was in bondage to its own doubt, and enslaved by its own denial.

Perforce of the spirit of the age we encounter in much of the religious life of our times what St. Paul encountered at Corinth. There is much of intellectual keenness and dialectic subtlety, a wide discursive knowledge of philosophic thought, and of science both true and "falsely so-called," much pretentiousness in literary and aesthetic culture, a broad eclecticism in religious systems, and a professed readiness to receive what is good in all, as standing upon a common level, and at the same time a real superficiality of knowledge in all branches, an instability commensurate with the general versatility, an esteem of truth

as only what each one troweth, self-will as a determining principle, an enthronement in much theological thought of what President Patton has felicitously called "that compound of Hegel and Schleiermacher, called the Christian consciousness."

We have come upon times distinguished by a curious jumble of theological apprehension in which many are not given to discrimination. We have positive and negative, evangelical and rationalistic, subjective and objective aspects of truth and untruth, scriptural and evolutionary, orthodox and heretical tendencies. A distinctively evangelical theology is pressed hard by this spirit of the age. The old time reverence for her metes and bounds is questioned, rationalistic marauders do not hesitate to invade her territory, and claim her precious teachings as legitimate prey for their critical methods. The critical spirit of the times, especially in its handling of the Old Testament, has shown itself not conciliatory, but in its excess and arrogance it is wont to be pragmatic and impertinent. We seem sometimes to be back, not as has been said in the times of the Reformation, but in the days of Paul, when the gospel was beleaguered by Pharasaic formalism and Greek scorn, sacerdotal assumption and rationalistic contempt. Much of the religious thinking of our times is in accord with the position of Mr. Lecky, the author of "European Morals," that the elements of recuperation are in man himself, and that Christianity is only one stage in the progress of the race, and that it will ultimately be outgrown and give place to a higher and more "unclouded light." We have come to a real theological crisis. Against evangelicalism in the past has come the leagued hosts of heathenism, of Rome, of infidelity, of hate, of perverted learning, and the sins of her own wayward children. She is confronted in this new crisis by a perverted liberalism, an indefinable latitudinarianism. This insidious enemy is sapping and mining at her walls, encompassing her with trenches, trying her bastions and pounding away at her parapets.

That you may know that I have not mistaken the age spirit in some of its theological aspects, allow me to adduce an example or two of characteristic teaching. One of the very plain claims of Christianity is this, that it is an exclusive and absolute re-

ligion. As such it can admit of no compromise with other religious faiths, for it stands upon an entirely different basis from them all. Other religions display the gropings of the human mind after God, Christianity is the revelation of God to man. The radical distinction between all man-made religions on the one side, and Christianity on the other, is that the first are human philosophy, or a meditation upon God, while the second is a divine life, wherein Jesus Christ gives to those who believe on his name power to become sons of God. Alongside of these high claims let me place the teaching of a recent volume of the Bampton lectures. Speaking in behalf of the theory that Christianity must comprehend what is beautiful and true and good in other religions, Canon Freemantle says: "What sometimes appears to be non-Christian virtue, is really a stunted, perhaps a perverted, form of Christian virtue. The ideal of life presented by Sakya Muni, or by Mahomet, or again by Plato, or by Marcus Aurelius, or in the later centuries by Lorenzo de Medici, or by Goethe, must partly be made to combine with our present Christian morality, partly be purified by it, partly be allowed to amplify our idea of what is morally good and Christian. If the word of God is the light of men everywhere, then it follows that all moral truth is essentially Christian truth and all true goodness Christian goodness." The meaning of this teaching is clear enough. It is this: the law of evolution holds good in both natural and spiritual worlds. The physical evolution of nature up to man is being followed by a spiritual evolution of man up to God. The test of Christianity as a universal religion, lies in its power not of dominating and absorbing these other religions, but of being assimilated by them. Here is naturalism pure and simple.

In an article on "The Need of a New Theology" in the *American Journal of Theology*, the successor of Henry Ward Beecher in Plymouth pulpit has recently said: "We are coming to see that there is no distinction between the supernatural and the natural; that the natural is all supernatural, and that the supernatural is all most natural.

Miracles are, therefore, no longer regarded by intelligent schol

ars as violations of the laws of nature. In a word the immanence of God is coming to be recognized as the fundamental fact in the new theology,—God in everything; all power belonging unto him: all phenomena, save only those of human sinfulness, manifestations of him." Here is a broad assumption that there is no distinction between the natural and supernatural. These transcendentalisms are not accepted by sound religious thought, 'tis true, but their persistent and widespread assertion means much.

These are not isolated examples of much that is current in theological teaching. The exigencies of this current liberalism have led some of its advocates to impose upon some of the most familiar terms of evangelicism, such as "atonement," and "remission of sins," an alien meaning and a sense foreign to all the uses of language. They have imposed upon the language of Christ and his apostles an interpretation which the language never was intended to convey. Such familiar theological words as God, immortality, revelation and Trinity have been made to convey totally indefinite ideas or no ideas at all. Indeed a school has grown up in this country, known abroad from its most distinguished representative as Ritschlianism, and participated in, we may believe, by many who never heard of Albrecht Ritschl, which disavows definition altogether and desires to substitute for it mere feeling. The teaching of this school is to this effect that definitions are not to be regarded as a trellis on which the vine climbs, but rather as tightening bands to repress all growth of the vine. Accordingly religious teachers long and loud are talking about the modern conception of God that is larger; of an immortality that is less sensuous; of a revelation that is more world-wide and vital; of a Trinity that is more consonant with the supreme fact of eternal unity in the universe; of an atonement that is more full of ethical inspiration. This specious theological phraseology has increased in volume until recently even Dr Lyman Abbott's theologically liberal *Outlook* has said: "The theological positivism of the past is giving place to a spiritual vagueness in the present, which is sometimes as much too vague as the former was too defined."

There are those who feel that religious thought, as indicated in much of the theological discussion of the times, is drifting as De Quincey would say, down to the Botany Bay of the universe. The alarm, however, is groundless. As the human race cannot change its nature or stop its thinking, neither can it drift permanently into any such teaching if it would. There is a stubborn sentiment abroad in this world that what fits man's moral nature and saves him from his sins is not going to be overthrown by infidel crowing or Christian weeping. Let us not commit the mistake, which is so common, of thinking that the worst of all ages is our own age, which means only this that we live in this age and have not been called on to live in another. The signs are encouraging and vast progress is being made in the establishment of the evangelical faith. It is conquering the intellect of man in spite of himself. True science is now theistic. Agnosticism, the latest phase of unbelief, is a concession. That incorrigible nescience which finds no God in the universe or in human history, and which leaves no trace of the souls immortality, except possibly in the evanescent memory of its earthly survivors and in its imponderable and undistinguishable influences over them—that finds but few advocates among cultivated people.

Unbelief now-a-days is buttressed far more by natural depravity than by natural science. Even rationalism itself, to the negations of which I have just alluded, is in a sense a result of the leaven of the gospel. Of course the old positions of unbelief are not abandoned. There are still people who do valiantly in battle for exploded theories and vanquished heresies in both science and religion. Such facts as I have adduced indicate clearly that the chief point of rationalistic attack to-day is the supernatural. New names and new methods and new combinations of forces are led to the field but the same purpose animates them all—to eliminate the supernatural factor from religion and find some principle which will meet the needs of man and the conditions of the universe without it. In the theological crisis of our times the battle for evangelicalism against the insidious and specious new rationalism, is on. The trials of the Church have thus assumed a new form. We have no open persecution to fear as when

"Diocletian's fiery sword
Worked busy as the lightning."

Possibly no time has ever been more favorable for giving what is called fair play to the Church. Rome in olden days tolerated everything but Christianity; our age seems to be tolerant of about everything in the name of Christianity. "We have not only given up burning men for their opinions," said the late archbishop of York, "but we have also given up thinking that there are any opinions worth burning or being burnt for." The times are peaceful, the flock secure, the duties of the shepherd plain, and yet there are dangers. A tide of rationalistic thought as in the last century, has been rising. Other tides have been like the eruption of Vesuvius, fierce and terrible but moving slowly and confined in narrow space. The viscous flood of fire has wrapt round tree and homestead and made them ashes. This flood is like the tide of the great sea, that penetrates every part; undermining the children's castle on the sand and flowing into every stone of the pier, and taking invisible tribute from the cliff, so that no particle that is below sea-level can escape the insidious contact. This new flood of rationalism that is rising will leave no inch dry. That which is soluble will dissolve and only that which is above the water-floods will entirely escape its effects.

This new rationalism which I have thus endeavored to indicate, has several well-known and clearly defined characteristics. First, it changes the emphasis from the deity of Christ to the personal worth of Christ; second, it changes the emphasis from the death of Christ to the teaching of Christ; third, it changes the emphasis from the supernatural to the natural; and, fourth, it changes the emphasis from the authority of the Bible to the authority of the Christian consciousness.

The question now recurs, how is this situation to be met by the Church and Christian teachers? In this contemporary loosening of the grip upon the supernatural the pulpit in many places has dropped down to the level of the platform. Some preachers have made the attempt to doctor the symptoms of the Church's ailments empirically and in an emotional and intermit-

tent sort of a way, instead of dealing scientifically with the disease itself by radical and constitutional treatment. Passing phases of thought have been elaborated into abnormal importance, and accordingly a part of the ministry has proceeded upon the assumption that the chief function of the pulpit was to defend Christianity against the Darwins, and Tyndalls and Spencers and other high priests of agnostic ignorance and critical presumption. In the secularizing and rationalistic tendencies of our times, it is a grave question whether a good part of the Church has not allowed her great cardinal doctrines to be pushed into the shade. As the enlarged experience which sheds increased light on the various truths of revelation not seldom runs parallel with the rise of new errors, the pulpit is called above all things else to do one thing—to set over against the negative side of error a foreground filled with positive truth.

The preaching then I take it, for our theological crisis, will consist in a revival of doctrinal preaching, a renewal, if you please, in the good sense of the word, of pulpit dogmatism. Believe me, men and brethren, there is no message, no witness, no example which the Church of God so sorely needs to-day as a revival in the pulpit of the really great themes of the Christian religion. There is need of a stiff evangelical interpretation of the Gospel which shall meet the real wants of man's nature. The age needs pre-eminently in its pulpit preachers, not lecturers; a gospel and not a philosophy; a message from heaven and not a scheme earth-evolved; a real message of hope and glad tidings of no dubious sound. The dangers from half belief are greater than from disbelief, because disbelief is frequently honest while half-belief never is, and cannot be. The preaching of that which is an ultimate fact in religion, of that which is pre-eminent in Christian thought, and everlasting in Christian belief has always begotten in the Church a better intellectual sanitation and a robuster character. Anything less on the part of the preacher than down-right loyalty to the absolute truth of Jesus Christ, handicaps faith, gives skeptical thought an immense advantage, manufactures obstacles to its own success and creates the forces that ultimately make its progress impossible. Preach-

ing is distinctively an ordinance of Christianity. It is not a sort of autocratic dogmatism, such as may have been pardonable when the clergy constituted the only learned profession. The occupant of a Christian pulpit is not called to decide *ex cathedra*, and with limitless pretentiousness on every new scientific discovery or critical hypothesis. The commission of the Head of the Church is this, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Comprehensive as this commission is it excludes a great many topics of popular interest. Science, literary criticism, politics, have their place in the curriculum of a universal learning, but that place is not in the pulpit.

The world needs the great remedy God has provided for the world's woes. When the world by human wisdom and philosophy knew not God, and was sunken in moral ignorance and sin, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save such as believed. The divine economy is still the true economy. Redemption is not of men but of God. Men are called to proclaim a definite message and to avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called. There are scientific, historical, philosophical and sociological themes proper enough in their places, but these may all be accepted or rejected without affecting a man's salvation: but the work of the Christian pulpit is always and everywhere a restricted work, viz.: to proclaim the history of redemption, the true philosophy of salvation. When the accredited ambassador speaks the message of his commission, the king speaks. If the prophet of to-day would speak with a voice which is like the sound of many waters, he must speak in positive tones.

If there is any one thing more needed than another at this moment, it is this—on the part of preachers,—the habit of absolutely unquestioning submission to the authority of Christ as a teacher sent from God. There is not a single mischievous tendency of the times in religion that would not be corrected by this habit. The teacher of religion is not so much to define God, as to proclaim him, not so much to furnish a complete and

systematic philosophy of the universe, as to be a herald of the incarnate God. To imagine that we can adapt our preaching the better to the age and its demands by weakening, concealing or abandoning the truth of its characteristic features, is to mistake the great need of the times. I take it therefore that the most urgent ministerial duty of the day is the reassertion of the great doctrines of the gospel with a new definiteness and earnestness. Until they are thus restored to their true place in the teaching and thought and life of some churches, the life of those churches will continue to be impoverished and their foundations unstable. Some great and vital truths have been relegated to obscurity and silence, if they have not been consciously and avowedly rejected. What we need therefore in the crises of which I have spoken, is a real revival of pulpit positivism.

In an article of so recent date as March 25th of this present year, Ian Maclaren has this to say: "We stand aghast at the mental attitude of our fathers who allowed no open questions, comprehending everything from the origins to the end of time and casting good men out for heresy on subjects about which no man could know anything." * * "We congratulate ourselves on our tolerance, and we do well, provided that it arises from modesty about mysteries or charity toward our fellow-men; but we do far from well if we are tolerant simply because we do not think there is any certainty possible in religion, or because we have no convictions to rouse our spirit. Preachers are affected by the atmosphere, and this to-day is anti-supernatural, so that without being conscious that their faith has been weakened, they come to state truth in terms of worldly wisdom. The personal God of the saints becomes the eternal something or other; He who was dead and is alive forevermore fades into the Christ idea; and immortality is to be taken as being saved from incredibility by the perpetually hopeful papers of the Psychical Society. One fears that in some quarters the pulpit has lost nerve. It may be that our fathers were too certain about everything; it would be an immense gain if some of us were absolutely sure about anything." This is sound teaching from what some would regard as an unexpected source. The

preacher must have a principle, an impulse, a line of action which will carry him beyond the negative result of making unbelief doubtful to the positive result of making belief credible. The only way in which the Church can hope to deal with negativism must be the strong and intelligent building up of faith, and the sooner that any minister can be convinced that it is not a special department of his pulpit work, to be undertaken with distinct preparation and with special effort, to tell men what *not* to believe, apart from his general work of preaching a positive gospel, the better for him and his work and his people. "The pulpit must be positive," said that great soul and true prophet, the late Phillips Brooks, "telling its message, trusting to the power of that message, expecting to see it blend into harmony with all other truth that fills the world; and the preacher, whatever else he may be elsewhere, in the pulpit must be positive, uttering truth far more than denying error."

The age can find no joy in the kingdom of heaven unless it finds there a source of authority to command the belief of the mind as well as the feeling of the heart. Not by any cheap personal magnetism are men to be charmed out of doubting into believing. Nothing but the eternal truth of God can meet the always shifting and yet always identical error and unbelief of man. The man who is preaching truth is thereby confuting error. Explicit and unflinching statement affords the best chance to correct an error, or to make the truth useful.

There is a popular condemnation of doctrinal preaching and a popular commendation of alleged practical preaching. Both are true or false according as they are interpreted. All preaching should be both doctrinal and practical. It should have a profound truth in it but a sharp edge on it. A doctrinal sermon without an object is like an unloaded rifle, and a practical application without a profound truth behind it, is like a gatling gun with no powder behind the bullets. I know that doctrinal preaching has sometimes been like unto a lecture on the science and art of bread making, instead of actually ministering bread to hungry men. You cannot have a sermon that is a sermon

without doctrine in it any more than you can have a loaf of bread without flour in it. It is good for us now and then to come back to the recollection, that while there are a thousand applications of the truth, and it may be stated in an endless variety of ways, yet that at bottom there are a few old things to which we must continually recur, and the substance of which must be found in everything we say. To the unperverted mind these old things are always fresh and new. To the taste that is not vitiated, simple bread never loses its charm and sparkling water is sweeter and more refreshing than the rarest vintages of the Rhine. The value of sound doctrine is not quoted in the markets of the world and accordingly thousands dominated by entirely secular views of life, remain insensible of its value. Unbelief has its interpretation, its philosophy of human existence. So likewise man has a capacity for fellowship with the infinite, and there is a true philosophy of the religious life. Its principles are enunciated in the Gospel of our Lord. It is with the moral character of God, the moral order of the world, the moral condition and hope of man, the moral nature of his own mission and the moral effect in history of his own career, that the mind of Christ is incessantly and absorbingly occupied, and about his teaching on all these subjects there is a pronounced pragmatic element. Nine and forty times in the brief and fragmentary record of the discourses of Jesus recurs this solemn phrase with which he authenticates his doctrine—"Verily I say unto you." Certain great truths are vital to the Gospel of the incarnation. Christ declared certain great doctrines, and if we deny them, or make them uncertain, the life which was built upon them has no meaning, no substance and no power. The defect in much cotemporary pulpit work, lies not in the lack of rational argument in behalf of the great evangelical doctrines, but in the doubt and hesitation upon the lips of some men who have been set apart to proclaim them. The unbelief of thousands is due to ignorance of what the great doctrines of Christianity really are. It is the chief function of the Christian preacher to present those elements of recuperation that do not appear in man himself. It is only with a background of atonement, and a Gospel of free

grace that repentance can avail. But there is no atonement or grace in a minimized gospel. Every heresy and perversion in the history of the Church has been vanquished and corrected by the revival of some great commanding doctrine. Augustine met the Pelagian heresy with the Epistle to the Romans, the stiffest doctrinal treatise of the New Testament. Luther met a false conception of works with the doctrine of faith. Wesley pierced the shadows of traditional formalism with the cry—"Ye must be born again." If I am not mistaken we are confronted to-day in much of the church's life, with a feeble and defective sense of the moral government of God, and a decayed sense of the guilt of sin. We need accordingly a reassertion of the nature and reality of the divine government, the great fact that God administers a real Government which will neither wrong the innocent nor clear the guilty; a government in which each moral agent will have the place in eternity which he ought to have, viz.: his own place; a government which implies a judgment to come and an actual penalty for incorrigible subjects. This great truth which pervades the word of God needs a new emphasis to-day. It will have to be restored to a more prominent place in the preaching of the pulpit before any profound awakening will take place. Men are not to be delivered from a blind and dazed infatuation of selfishness and luxurious life, by the droning of pater-nosters, the setting up of bland analogies or some sweet story of the development of life.

And what is true of this doctrine is equally true of all the really great truths of religion. They must have a larger place in the message of the pulpit. Preachers are *ex officio* guardians of Christian doctrine. They are to claim the leadership of popular discussion upon the great themes of religion, and to show by their mastery of the subject their ability and, therefore, their right to hold that leadership. Never should a revival of popular inquiry upon a Christian doctrine be allowed to come to a head in any reconstruction of opinion without the wise and winning voice of the pulpit. We who are called to preach are under the most solemn obligation to make known to others whatever God has revealed concerning the condition and destiny

of our race. We are not to plead an invincible reluctance to speak them because they are too awful and unfathomable for our plummet lines, even in our silent and solitary thought. We are bound to tell men the real facts and doctrines of evangelicism, concealing nothing and minimizing nothing. Christ himself is responsible for the revelation he has made to our race. To improve upon it, to suppress what we think is likely to provoke resentment, to insist upon what we think will conciliate, is no part of our duty. The legitimate apostolic succession is not that which insists upon an original donation of grace, communicated from age to age by the formal touch of certain ecclesiastical persons, but that which has consistently maintained apostolic doctrine. The true minister is not a priest; he does not stand between God and man to mediate between them; he is not called to offer up sacrifices, or to be the dispenser of a grace exclusively committed to him. He is the successor of the prophetic rather than the priestly order. He is called and set apart teacher of divine truth. The holy place in his church is the case which holds the sacred scroll. His instrument is not a sacrifice but the truth of God. "To be God's mouthpiece when God is not speaking through him," says the Rev. Robert F. Horton, "is a fraud of the palpable kind which men will not away with" * * * "All manner of sins may be forgiven a preacher—a harsh voice, a clumsy delivery, a bad pronunciation, an insufficient scholarship, a crude doctrine, an ignorance of men; but there is one defect which cannot be forgiven, for it is a kind of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—it cannot be forgiven him if he preaches when he has not received a message from God."

"All around the circle of human doubt and despair, where men and women are going out to enlighten and uplift and comfort and strengthen their fellow men under the perplexities and burdens of life," says the author of "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt," "we hear the cry for a gospel which shall be divine, and therefore sovereign and unquestionable and sure and victorious."

Preaching such great vitalizing doctrines the preacher can stand on the power of God rather than on the natural effects of

human causation. What church history sufficiently verifies is this that without an ample witness to such truths as the Trinity, the atonement, the person and work of Christ, and the supremacy of the divine word, no blessing can be expected on the ministry of any church. "The boastful shouts of error," says Dr. Henry Van Dyke, "have been the advertisements of the silent truth. Error has had kings and generals, philosophers and orators, empires and armies; truth has had God. Error has had swords and spears, ships and cannon, fortresses and dungeons, racks and fires; but truth has had God." No other subjects than such as are included in the great doctrines of the gospel can be sure of commanding the coöperation of the third person of the adorable Trinity. Philosophy, poetry, art, literature, and sociology are attractive subjects to many minds, and they who handle such themes in the pulpit may set them forth with alluring words of human genius, but there is no certainty that the Holy Ghost will accompany their presentation with his divine attestation. It ought therefore to be the supreme question with the preacher, what themes can assuredly command the witness of the Spirit rather than what topics will enlist itching ears.

No doubt there has been a reaction from the scholastic forms in which certain Christian doctrines were presented while the influence of rationalism was strongly felt, but signs multiply that theology, in the pulpit and out, is again going to vindicate its claim to be considered as an essential factor even in man's intellectual life. It will adapt itself to changed conditions but the revival will come. "Theologians may console themselves," says the author of the 'Cure of Souls', "with the reflection that all the railing and girding at doctrine is simply one of the innumerable forms of modern cant, and that theology is an absolute necessity." That eccentric historian and romanticist Renan made a strange remark not long before his death: "I fear," said he, "that the work of the twentieth century will consist in taking out of the waste-basket a multitude of excellent ideas which the nineteenth century has heedlessly thrown into it." The skeptic's fear is the believer's hope, and it would not be a strange issue indeed of such times as ours, if out of them there should come early in the twentieth century a great demand for a revival of

the preaching of the great doctrines, such as the Trinity, the atonement, and kindred majestic and dignified themes. Already we may see the Renaissance of dogmatics in the recent publication of such books as Harris' "Self Revelation of God;" Fairbairn's "Place of Christ in Modern Theology;" Scott's "Nicene Theology;" Stearns' "Present Day Theology," and "Evidence of Christian Experience," and Jacobs' "Elements of Religion." These and innumerable other books, both small and great, as well as the magazines, not distinctly of the theological order, indicate that the revival has really come.

But some men want doctrinal preaching they say, but with the strenuous demand that it be set forth according to "the spirit of the age." In this demand is truth and likewise the possibility of error. All theology is progressive, and we can as we go back along the line of the Christian ages, stop at the successive points of time when the present accepted doctrines of the Church, one after another, reached a definite form. In the history of our religion Scripture is original; systems of doctrine are derivative. Dr. Philip Schaff has said, "Every age must produce its own theology, adapted to its peculiar condition and wants," while one of the best accredited scholars of our own Church, Prof. Henry E. Jacobs, has said, "As with our sermons, so it must also be with our theology; we cannot depend upon translations, except as merely temporary expedients. The matter remains permanent; but the form changes not only with the language, but with the age, the currents of thought and the diverse classes of errors and attacks that succeed one another with great rapidity. We must speak the language of the time and place where Providence has placed us." The adaptation must thus be in such incidents as language and not in any change in the substance of Christian doctrine. New meanings are constantly coming out of the teaching of Jesus in every age and in every land. It is not that each succeeding century and race adds something of its own to the doctrines of the gospel, but this rather, that each finds in that source something which was meant to become its own, and so to satisfy its deepest needs. New approaches demand new defences, and perhaps if we were called upon to make a statement of doctrine adapted

to meet the battle-front of to-day, we could and would profitably dismount some artillery that has been used to defend the logical relations of God's thoughts and purposes in a past eternity, and carry it around to that side of the fortress where the ground shakes with new assaults. There is such a thing as continuity in the Christian doctrines. Tradition is bad, but mere iconoclastic anti-traditionalism is not much better. The Bible has a meaning and that meaning can be discovered by impartial, inductive research, just as well as can the laws of nature. No criticism which is not stone blind can get out of the New Testament any other doctrine than that of the evangelical faith. Augustine and Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian, Luther and Calvin were not fools but great men, and he who fails to recognize that fact is himself guilty of insensate and preposterous folly. Theology itself is our thoughts of God, our beliefs concerning Christ, our knowledge of the Bible. It is clear enough that God does not change, nor the gospel of his love, nor can the record in which that gospel is enshrined. It is not necessarily a narrow-minded function to stand for old doctrines but rather a high function of stewardship and defence. The experience of one thousand eight hundred years has proved that the world needs no new and modified gospel of adjustment. What then does the modern pulpit need? Just what the old pulpit wanted—a sense of the sinfulness of man and the remedial forces provided for it, and as well attested as amply provided. The old doctrines fit the spiritual needs of this century as closely as they fitted the same needs of the first. They carry the same attractions and credentials in the western hemisphere as at first in the eastern. The best preaching for the times is the preaching for all times. The work of the Christian preacher therefore is not to map out the surface currents of the ocean but to give his time to deep sea soundings. He cannot afford to be merely the student of the earth's gravel and drift, the debris of ransacked glaciers and the flotsam of lost rivers, but it is his office to go down into the granitic and azoic heart of the great doctrines of the gospel, and when he turns aside from these legiti-

mate themes of pulpit discourse to make the shifting events of the day the staple of his discourse he betrays his office and understands neither his duties nor the needs of his age. The molds and forms of the gospel, the incidents not essential to its validity may change; but *the* gospel the *only* gospel, disentangled from all human speculations, the gospel which Paul carried from Asia into Europe, the great message that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, that gospel is a positive, a definite, a dogmatic gospel that admits of no abridgment and is wanted for all ages wherein men sin and suffer and thirst after righteousness.

Even the concessions of liberalists bear testimony to the necessity of declaring unto men virile beliefs. Unitarianism shall not likely see a higher authority in our times than James Martineau, and this was his frank confession touching the huskiness of Unitarian theology, literature and philosophy as food for souls,—“I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians all seem to me to contrast unfavorably with their opponents. I am conscious that my deepest obligations as a learner from others are in almost every department to writers not of my own creed.” Again, listen to Thos. Starr King, one of the most eloquent, candid, and popular of the champions of Socinianism in this century. In a glowing passage on the evangelical doctrine of an expiatory atonement he says: “It is ennobled by the holiest memories, as it has been consecrated by the loftiest talent of Christendom. It fired the fierce eloquence of Tertullian in the early church, and gushed in honeyed period from the lips of Chrysostom; it enlisted the life-long zeal of Athanasius to keep it pure; the sublimity of it fired every power and commanded all the resources of the mighty soul of Augustine; the learning of Jerome and the energy of Ambrose were committed to its defense; it was the text for the subtle eye and the analytic thought of Aquinas; it was the pillar of Luther’s great soul toiling for man; it was shaven into intellectual and systematic symmetry by the iron logic of John Calvin; it

inspired the beautiful humility of Fenelon, fostered the devotion and self-sacrifice of Oberlin; flowed like molten metal into the rigid forms of Edward's intellect and kindled the deep and steady rapture of Wesley's heart. * * All the great enterprises of Christian history have been born from the influence, immediate or remote, which this vicarious theory of redemption has exercised upon the mind and heart of humanity." Could confirmation of what I have said be stronger in a time when much of popular literature seems surcharged with attacks on "Intellectualism" and "Dogmatism," and glowing with highly colored portrayals of "good Christians" of every name and no name, of every faith and no faith, under each of which stands the legend written that since good Christians arise under every form of faith or no faith alike, it cannot be a matter of much importance what men believe; that the highest intellectual achievement is to believe nothing, and that to believe anything earnestly and vigorously is an infallible sign of intellectual weakness. Such teaching of an emasculated religiousness will train, not strong men for the kingdom, but a generation conforming to Marheineke's characterization of Paulas, a representative of the older or so-called "vulgar" rationalism, as one "who believes that he thinks and thinks that he believes, but was incapable of either."

And you will permit me on this denominational occasion to express my growing appreciation and conviction of the scripturalness, adaptability and utility of that particular apprehension of doctrine known in the history of the Church as Lutheranism. It has no characteristic feature that we could improve by alteration. It contains those elements of efficiency which in times past have proved to be the power of God, and to contain those strong features of evangelicalism, in contradistinction with rationalistic negation and Romanistic legalism and pretentiousness, which have gladdened the world. Our faith has been of vast blessing to this world and we need not fear that it will fail of the same result in time to come. This is an age of progress. Let us progress in an intelligent appreciation of the significance of our past history and of the promise of the future which it

embodies. Let us progress, not by changing a system which has been baptized by the unction of the Holy Ghost; but let us progress by utilizing the truth for which we stand in all holy activities, in all Christian work, and in our love for souls for whom Christ died, and in the intelligence and ardor of our zeal for the glory of God and for the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. What God did in the time past for and through our fathers is but the type and promise of what he will do for us now. The historian Sallust tells us that the Roman mothers trained their children in the presence of the busts and statues of their ancestors. We should train our rising ministry, as it were in the presence of their forefathers in the faith, and urge them as the Roman mothers did, to be inspired and strengthened by the fact that they are to serve in a Church holding fast to truths which the world needs and to which they are to bear witness, only adapting themselves to the ever-varying circumstances of the changing ages. We have a creed of positive doctrines, including the best parts of the traditional orthodoxy, without going into interminable details, while at the same time guarding against all possible dangerous implications. The great confession of 1530 is such a creed as that. It is comprehensive, satisfactory, and as a doctrinal basis is sound and ample enough and needs neither revision nor addition.

In the light of these truths, fathers and brethren, it shall be my high aim to deepen the sense of what a privilege it is to be a minister of Christ's Gospel at this particular time. We need a learned and thoughtful ministry,—watchmen alert, instructed and able to meet the peculiar demands of a theological crisis; men who can think, who are passionately religious, skilled in the theology, and withal acquainted with contemporary problems. Preachers must be trained not only to trust the truth but likewise to know where and how to apply that truth. It is the high function of a theological school to teach young men from the first that their business is to find out what is true for their particular message, and then declare it to the world in its completeness with all the lunge and earnestness of profound conviction. We need men of trained endowments of mind to make

the really great truths of religion real and plain—men whose scholarship is like a plate glass window, protecting and yet revealing the great doctrines of the divine and infallible word. Intellectual discipline, spiritual power, Biblical scholarship are the three needs of the preacher. If the spirit of the Lord and the mind of the Son of Man united to make a preacher in the Nazareth synagogue, it is surely not too much to demand in our time the vital union of trained mental powers and the spirit of the Lord in the noblest work man ever gave himself unto, the study of God's thoughts, in human terms for human needs. If the pulpit has lost power, absolutely or comparatively, it is because the men in the pulpit have neglected one of these three conditions of power. If, as the critics of the pulpit say, preachers were once mightier than they are now, it is because they thought more. When the mind is neglected, goes about in dressing gown and slippers, spends its hours in the easy chair rather than in the gymnasium, the preacher becomes a pigmy in a theological crisis. What we need is a revival of Christian theology in the Christian pulpit.

That young man who is looking to the ministry as his life calling and proceeds upon the assumption that men are not interested in theology, is unfitted for the kingdom at this time, and before he starts. As another has said: "Every platform speech is seasoned with the theological controversy of the hour. Boys sell tracts and sermons along with the journals of the day. Doctrinal novelettes shine in the monthly magazines and stately symposia sit in the solemn banquet chambers of the quarterlies." When ministers shall pursue theological studies as Melancthon says he did, for personal spiritual benefit; when theological science shall be wrought into the very soul, inducing a theological mood; when through learning, and diligent self-discipline, shall go hand in hand with deep love for God and souls, we have a ministry of disciplined intellect, spiritual power, and Biblical scholarship, and such as is never wanting in power over men.

In the Vatican there is a celebrated fresco by Raphael in which the great master has put on record his conception of the

exalted character and the magnetic spell of theology. A beautiful woman, austere and chaste, with laurel intertwined in her hair, and with the gospels in her hand, points to the picture below, while two cherubs by her side hold up tablets containing these words "*Divinarum Rerum Notitia*"—"the knowledge of divine things." The painting deals with earth and heaven as a whole. A cloud divides the canvas into two halves. In the upper half the heavenly world is depicted. The Trinity is presented according to the symbolism customary at the time. Beneath the divided cloud which is suggestively broken through by the descending spirit and by some cherubs bearing the Holy Scriptures, the earthly assembly of believers is portrayed. Arranged right and left of another, where the eucharist is displayed and upon which the Holy Spirit is falling, a great company is seen. Jerome the diligent student of Scripture is there; and Ambrose the indefatigable Bishop of Milan; and Augustine the greatest of the fathers; and Bernard the mystic and preacher who directed the consciences of kings; and Gregory the exegete; Aquinas "the angelic doctor" and the systematizer; Boneventura "the seraphic doctor" and the Lord's biographer; Peter Lombard the master of sentences, and Scotus Erigena the master of arguments. It is the office of him who is called to the work upon which I have entered to introduce young men who aspire to be Christian teachers and pastors, to the goodly company of these and others who have wrought in that superb science which has to deal with God in the mystery of his being and the mercy of his doing, and with man in the majesty of his nature and the misery of his fall.

When Helena was searching at Jerusalem for the wood of the true cross, she arranged a line of beacons to the royal city of her son Constantine. Watchers waited by day and by night, each keenly observing his signal point. The dried wood and the resinous gums were heaped high and guarded well. At length to him who watched like Elijah upon Carmel, a distant light appeared. At first it seemed a star, then it grew into a glory, and then he, too, lit his torch and fired his beacon, and one beyond him caught it up, and that same evening all Con-

stantinople was ablaze with joy. Swiftly as ran that ancient flame from headland to headland, and from height to height, shall some day run the flash of a nobler triumph. In it each weary watcher shall have his part. In it each faithful pastor, each herald of a sound gospel, shall take his share. In it as the long flames leap up in every land, shall we at last behold that glory which shall nevermore grow dim on land or sea. I trust that I am fully conscious of the dignity, gravity and responsibility of him who is called to train young men in that practical theology which will make of them true heralds and watchful sentinels in this honored succession.

Mr. President, fathers and brethren, and friends of the seminary, in the professorship into which I am now inducted, I shall hope to create some enthusiasm for the highest of all studies and an intelligent devotion in the noblest of all callings. I feel that the spirit that should animate this hour is that of hope in the opportunity here offered for usefulness in the Master's service, confidence in the sympathy and coöperation of the constituency of our beloved institution. The position and principles of our seminary are no uncertain quantities. It stands for a broad sympathy with the interests of the universal kingdom of our Lord, for loyalty to the life of the body of Christians to which we belong, and for a consistent Lutheranism fairly and generously interpreted. We are at the gateway of two centuries. Behind us are the years of our fathers, around us in the heritage they have given us, before us is the land to be possessed. We regard with gratitude to God the heritage of our Church. We thank him for its beginning, its ecumenical progress and its hopeful present. We praise him for the faith of our fathers, as they set foot upon yonder ground and claimed it for a training school for the ministry. We praise him for the heritage of truth our Church has guarded and handed down to us, along with the memory of godly lives, steadfast faith and heroic labors. We accept reverently the responsibilities of our time and place.

With humility of spirit, and an acknowledgment of allegiance only to one Master, even Christ, and with the purpose to teach

his gospel with reverent boldness, in the difficult duty assigned me, I earnestly invite the sympathy, and the prayers of all who desire the perpetuation of a sound and scriptural ministry and who love the kingdom and wait for the coming of our one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

ARTICLE IV.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE SALZBURGERS.

By PROF. A. G. VOIGT, D. D.

It is a widespread opinion among the Lutherans of this country that John Wesley in his voyage to Georgia in 1736 was deeply impressed by the composure and religious serenity of Salzburgers, who were coming to this country at the same time; and so that great change in spirit which became so significant not only for Wesley individually, but for the whole world, is in some measure to be traced back to the Salzburgers. This opinion was expressed in a recent article in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. It can be found in Dr. Wolf's "Lutherans in America" and in Dr. Jacobs' "History of the American Lutheran Church." It is quite fully maintained and defended in Strobel's "History of the Salzburgers."

Notwithstanding these eminent authorities, a reading of the first part of Wesley's Journal long ago convinced us that there was a misapprehension in this view, and a renewed examination of the sources of information has confirmed us in that conviction. These sources of information are two: Wesley's Journal and Urlsperger's *Nachrichten Salzburgischer Emigranten*. From these sources we think it can be shown that John Wesley was not influenced on his voyage in the manner described for three reasons: first, John Wesley was not in the same ship with the Salzburgers; second, the Salzburgers did not possess that passive spirit which characterized the people by whom Wesley was impressed; third, Wesley could not have confused Salzburgers with Moravians.

We proceed now to explain these reasons in detail.

First, John Wesley and the Salzburgers were not in the same ship. It was the third company of Salzburgers who came over in the expedition which brought John Wesley to Savannah. The Salzburgers were under the direction of *commissarius* Philip George Frederic von Reck, who kept a careful diary of the voyage in which he shows himself to have been an observant man. This diary may be found in Urlsperger's Nachrichten. From it we learn that he arrived in London on the 3rd of October, 1735, and his company of emigrants arrived the next day. On the 7th he received a land grant in Georgia of five hundred acres. On the 24th of October a part of the expedition, consisting of one hundred and fifty persons, English, French, German and Irish, embarked at London on the ship London Merchant, which set sail on the 28th. Von Reck says the ship of Gov. Oglethorpe, the Simonds, had set sail for Gravesend several days before. Now it is not absolutely impossible that the Salzburgers were separated and a part put on the Governor's vessel. But there is not the least probability that it was so. The company was not large (the precise figure we are not able to give), so that it could easily be accommodated on the one ship. It is not likely that when they were under the direction of von Reck they would be placed in another ship. But the decisive argument is that von Reck nowhere intimates that any of his Salzburgers were in the other ship, but speaks of them as being in the same ship with himself.

From the Journal of John Wesley we learn that he embarked on the Simmonds (so he spells the name) at Gravesend, on the 14th of October. Doubtless he used the old style calendar. Adding eleven days for correction, the date of his embarkation becomes October 25th. This corresponds with the dates given by von Reck. The expedition was made up of these two ships, which were afterwards joined at the Isle of Wight by a vessel of war as a convoy. Wesley says there were twenty-six Germans on his vessel. David Nitschmann was Bishop of the Germans. When he arrived at Savannah he associated with the

Germans, whose pastor was Spangenberg. It is evident that these Germans were Moravians. From Wesley's Journal we learn that there was a small colony of Moravians in Savannah. Doubtless Bishop Nitschmann conducted another company of Moravian colonists to join them. Wesley speaks of the Germans on his ship as if they were a unit, having their own regular services. Nor is it probable that so small a number as twenty-six should consist of a mixture of Moravians and Salzburger. During a long delay at the Isle of Wight there was abundant opportunity for the passengers to visit the other ship and Wesley says such visits were made. Moreover, on one occasion in mid-ocean von Reck dined on the ship in which John Wesley was by invitation of Gov. Oglethorpe. Now if there had been anything in common between the Moravians and Salzburger, or between the latter and Wesley, some intimation of it should appear in the Diary of von Reck, or the Journal of Wesley. But the latter makes not the slightest reference to Salzburger in the part of his Journal which describes his voyage; and von Reck makes no allusion to the Moravians. The simple reason is they were in separate ships and there was nothing in common between them.

This circumstance, that the Salzburger were not in the same vessel with Wesley, should settle the case as far as receiving impressions from them on board of the vessel is concerned. But there is another circumstance which tends to establish the same view. The Salzburger did not possess that kind of a religious spirit which Wesley says impressed him. It was the quietism of the Moravians which affected Wesley. We think the diary of von Reck indicates that he and his party did not have that kind of a passive spirit. Wesley describes the character and conduct of the Germans on his ship as follows: "I had long before observed the great seriousness of their behaviour, of their humility they had given a continual proof, by performing those servile offices for the other passengers, which none of the English would undertake; for which they desired and would receive no pay, saying, 'It was good for their proud hearts' and 'their loving Saviour had done more for them.' And every day had

been given them occasion of showing a meekness, which no injury could move. If they were pushed, struck or thrown down, they rose again and went away; but no complaint was found in their mouth. There was now an opportunity of trying whether they were delivered from the spirit of fear, as well as from that of pride, anger, and revenge. In the midst of the psalm where-with their service began, the sea broke over, split the main-sail in pieces, covered the ship, and poured in between the decks, as if the great deep had already swallowed us up. A terrible screaming began among the English. The Germans calmly sang on. I asked one of them afterwards, 'Was you not afraid?' He answered, 'I thank God, no.' I asked, 'But were not your women and children afraid?' He replied mildly, 'No; our women and children are not afraid to die.' "

Now this sort of quietistic passivity characterizes Moravians, but we would not expect to find it among Lutherans. We would rather expect a healthy human fear notwithstanding their trust in God. And in fact we find it was so. While the London Merchant was off Cowes waiting for a favorable wind, von Reck, his brother and a Herr von Hermsdorff went to shore in a boat. On their return they were overtaken by a storm which imperiled their lives. Von Reck describes the scene and his feelings as follows: "The darkness of the night and dense fog, the noise of the mighty wind, the roaring of the swelling and foaming waves, which at times struck us, the fatigue of our pilot, who had become quite exhausted by the rowing, the thought of so important a matter as going out of time into a blessed or un-blessed eternity, the only moment which still seemed to be left to us in time, the needed assurance of grace and of the forgiveness of our sins in this life, all this doubled the natural fear in us and pressed from our anxious hearts fervent sighs for help and grace, which God also granted us in the midst of our anxiety. Finally we came so near to the ship that a rope could be thrown to us from it, which we seized and in this way were saved. As soon as we entered the cabin, we were not ashamed of throwing ourselves upon our knees before the Lord our God, in the presence of the English, as half-dead, to praise him and to con-

secrete to him the life granted to us for Christ's sake anew with most humble thanks. Oh my God! How did I and my companions feel at that time in our danger!"

Von Reck felt much as John Wesley says he felt during stormy weather, and this was very different from the passivity displayed by the Moravians whom Wesley so much admired.

But we are not left to inferences from the conduct of these three men on this occasion to judge that the attitude of the Salzburgers generally in a storm was not one of quiet passivity like that attributed to the Moravians by Wesley. Von Reck also gives an account of that very storm in which the English minister so admired the Germans. Wesley dates it Sunday the 25th of January. Eleven days added to correct the old style of calendar makes February the 5th. Von Reck dates it the night of the 5th and 6th. Wesley represents the worst as occurring from seven until twelve o'clock in the night. Besides, von Reck says that the main-sail of the *Simonds* was torn by a huge wave, a circumstance also mentioned by Wesley in the passage quoted above, in which we see the calm conduct of the Germans which so deeply impressed him. Now during that very storm the Salzburgers under the conduct of von Reck were much agitated. He says in his diary of their conduct in that storm: "In this danger we thought of the example of the ancients, that the Lord hears the cry of the distressed. We remembered his tender mercy, by which he never forsook us in any distress. It was our custom to gather daily for our edification; but to-day we were driven together by the storm. We ventured upon the word, 'Call upon me in trouble.' We approached the throne of grace with weeping and prayer, and in this manner appeared before the Father with our Advocate. Who for the sake of his dear Son could refuse us no petition. After the hour of prayer I betook myself to a dark cabin and went to bed, but on account of great anxiety from my sins, my evil conscience and unbelief I could not sleep. Every blow of the waves against the ship was a violent blow upon my heart, and I had nought to oppose to the violence of the waves and the fear of death but yearning sighs and hope of grace for Christ's sake."

We think from this weeping and anxiety it is evident that

these were not the people who impressed Wesley so peculiarly.

Finally we think it is impossible to conceive that Wesley did not know how to distinguish the Salzburgers from the Moravians. Mr. Strobel must have felt that the foundation of his argument was insecure. He felt there was a serious difficulty in the fact that Wesley mentions Moravians only, and not Salzburgers. We think the obvious reason for saying nothing about Salzburgers is that there were none in Wesley's ship and that Wesley knew it.

What are the probabilities in the case? Is it probable that an educated man like Wesley and one interested in religious matters, should have been ignorant of the most notorious fact in the religious history of the time? The heartless persecution of the Salzburgers had sent a thrill through all Europe. Could Wesley have taken no note of it, nor of the persons who were the interesting victims of this persecution, so that he could not tell them from Moravians? Is this at all conceivable, when he was in the service of the very company that was aiding these poor people and giving them homes in the very colony in which he was to labor himself? Wesley could not have been ignorant who the Salzburgers were.

But we have more than surmisings on this point. Wesley did not publish his Journal just as he wrote it. He edited it with omissions. Now if it were possible that he did not know how to distinguish Salzburgers from Moravians while he was on the ship, he certainly would not have continued that confusion after he learned to know who the Salzburgers really were. He would certainly have corrected the Journal if there had been need of correction. Both his Journal and Urlsperger's Nachrichten show an acquaintance of Wesley with the Salzburgers at a later time. In the latter, one of the letters of Bolzius, one of the pastors at Ebenezer, refers to a visit he made to John Wesley in Savannah, who, not being in the town at the time, had left a courteous letter for his visitor. In his Journal Wesley tells briefly of a visit to Ebenezer in 1737. He made this visit with August Spangenberg, the Moravian pastor in Savannah. He describes it in these words: "In the evening we came to New Ebenezer, where the poor Salzburgers are settled. The

industry of this people is quite surprising. Their sixty huts are neatly and regularly built, and all the little spots of ground between them improved to the best advantage. One side of the town is a field of Indian corn; on the other are the plantations of several private persons; all which together one would scarce think it possible for a handful of people to have done in one year.

Twelve years later, in 1749, he notes the receipt of a letter from Ebenezer in Georgia, written by John Martin Bolzium, which he published in part in his Journal. In the same connection he expresses regret that when he was at Savannah he refused to admit Bolzium to the Lord's table, because he had not been baptized by one episcopally ordained. In his letter Bolzium had written that 'the Lord had not permitted the Herrnhuters (falsely called Moravians), nor other false teachers, to creep in among us.' This remark greatly pleased Wesley for by this time his connection with the Moravians was broken. John Wesley well knew the difference between Salzburgers and Herrnhuters.

And he must have known the difference on the voyage. For he visited the London Merchant on which they sailed, and Commissarius Von Reck visited the Simonds, in which he made the voyage.

If there is any honor in having deeply impressed the already earnest spirit of John Wesley, we must accord it to the Moravians. The reputation of the Salzburgers for piety will suffer no injury by the correction of the widespread error discussed in this article.

ARTICLE V.

THE WORD OF GOD IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

[BAUGHER LECTURE ON CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA., DELIVERED MAY 31, 1897.]

BY EDWARD T. HORN, D. D.

I appreciate the invitation to deliver the Baugher Lecture on Christian Worship. This foundation has contributed to an extension of true knowledge on this subject and is a promise of continued investigation and discussion. That the true principles of Christian worship are not universally discerned is shown by the very different types of worship which exist. That its history is not fairly studied by all, is proven by the contradictory theories which are urged by Romanist, Anglican and Puritan.

Having attempted at a former time to exhibit the Lutheran Sources of the Common Service, I have a desire also to show the other sources from which they are derived. But this would require a dull citation of originals, ill-suited to an oral lecture. I have chosen as my subject, *The Word of God in Christian Worship*. I do not propose to argue the supreme importance of the Word of God in the Lutheran Service; a position vindicated by Luther; and asserted with great force by a venerable teacher in this school. Let us take it for granted. The preëminence of the Word of God is the principle of Christian Worship. The attempt which I shall make to supply a commentary on the service of Christian Worship as an embodiment and realization of that principle, will, I hope, of itself establish it.

By "Christian Worship" I do not mean *all* forms of worship that at any time or place have been used by Christian men. I mean that use which is acknowledged and authorized among us. We are to be congratulated on the possession of a standard order of worship, a basis of comparison, a subject for study, a definite principle in the education and life of the Church. Of this I claim that it is a genuine development of the Christian principle, embodying the truth which must underlie Christian

worship, freed from false accretions. Therefore, if we take it as our text, we may appeal to all Christian history for illustration while we analyze it. It is as really the worship of the Christian Church as our creeds set forth the Church's belief. Again, it is the service of worship of the Christian Church as it was reformed and purified by our teachers in the XVI. Century. It preserves *their* conception of what the worship of the Church ought to be; their rescue of the principles of communion with God from the abuses which in their day threatened to overwhelm them, and which in our day are reasserting themselves, and, fortified by the failure of the rejection of the historical service, need to be met again with the Word of God. I do not deny the Christianity of all other forms of worship than ours; but assert that this is the pure and complete service of Christian worship. My text, therefore, will be *the Common Service*.

I.

What do we mean by *the Word of God in the Worship of the Church*? God's word is the Revelation of Himself through His Son. "The Word of God" is not exactly identical with what we mean by "the Holy Scriptures." Dr. Fisher says in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, that although "the identity of the Holy Scriptures with the Word of God is generally assumed by Luther, and is occasionally expressed in explicit language," "the Word of God is a phrase which signifies to Luther the gospel of God's grace, whether it be proclaimed orally or in the Scriptures."

NOTE.—Compare the use of the word *Gospel* in the New Testament. Our Lord adopted this word, the *Gladtidings*, as the designation of that which He brought and told. In the lips of His disciples it became the customary description of His life and word and work. The manifestation, the teaching, the purpose, the commandment, the commission of Jesus, are habitually spoken of as *The Good News*. It meant the *Revelation of Christ* in the widest sense. St. Paul gave it a still wider connotation. It was not only the Revelation of Christ as set down in the stories of His life and the teachings of His disciples, in the faith once delivered to the saints and confessed again in their worship, but it meant to him the entire life of the Church, the purpose that absorbed its energies, the trust committed to it by the Master at His parting, the wonderful future which awaited it in

the world and in the world to come. The wonderful message he brought to the Philippians was the *beginning* of the Good News. In the mind of the Apostle and the Early Church the word Gospel included the faith, the fellowship of believers, and its mighty calling and work. It meant also the aggregate of the regenerative forces which the good news brought and applied. With this compare Clem. Rom. I. 47. Ign. *ad Phil.* 5, 8, 9. *ad Smyrn.* 5, 7. Mart. Pol. 19, 22. Of the use of Ignatius, the Dict. C. Biog., III. 218. says, "The Gospel is that which the apostles as the presbyterate of the Church proclaimed. It means not the four written gospels, but the substance of the message of salvation." Cf. also *Irenaeus*, II., 1, "We have learned from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and, at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith." 4, 2. "Many nations of those who believe in Christ do assent, having salvation written in their hearts by the Spirit, without paper and ink."

"The Church," says Dale, "existed before the Scriptures. The contents of the Christian revelation were made known by living speech before they were received in writing." When the first congregation gathered in Jerusalem, or the first Gentile Christians at Antioch, in the rapidly multiplying congregations of Asia Minor and Greece, the word of God, the New Testament as well as the Old, was the principle of their worship before one of the apostles had put pen to paper. The stories of the words and works of Jesus told by the apostles or their messengers, the explanations and applications of the Old Testament they offered, the injunctions and frequent criticisms based on the teaching of Christ, were the word of God. The Scriptures bear witness to a worship of the Church of which the teaching of the apostles was a part. The fourth and fifth chapters of the first Epistle to the Thessalonians show the Church using matter of Holy Scripture before it was written (4 : 1, 2), the New Testament in process of formation, (4 : 13-18), and the Church receiving the New Testament as it was being written (5 : 27).

It must also be admitted that there were other ways of setting that word forth than by words either written or spoken. There were signs of fellowship, symbols of the deep truths Jesus had taught, of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, of the commu-

nion between Him and them, which were as truly a Word of God as these books are. Had not St. Paul said that as often as they eat the bread and drank the wine, they did tell the Lord's death till He would come? So Luther says, "Christ, our Bread, is given to us in two ways; first, outwardly, through men, as for instance through the priests and teachers. And this also in two ways, first through the Word and secondly, through the Sacrament of the Altar." (21, 204.) So the *Apology*, 214, 4, 5: "When we are baptized, when we eat the Lord's body, when we are absolved, they ought certainly to assure us that God truly forgives us for Christ's sake. God at the same time by the Word and rites move hearts to believe and conceive faith.

* * Just as the word enters the ears in order to strike hearts; so the rite itself meets the eyes, in order to move hearts. The effect of the word and the rite is the same, as it has been well said by Augustine that a sacrament is "a visible word." And Luther says in the Smalkald Articles, III. iv., "We will now return to the Gospel, which not merely in one way gives us counsel and aid against sin; for God is superabundantly rich in His grace. First, through the spoken Word, by which the forgiveness of sins is preached in the whole world; which is the peculiar office of the Gospel. Secondly, through Baptism. Thirdly, through the holy sacrament of the altar. Fourthly, through the power of the Keys, and also through the mutual conversation and consolation of brethren. Matt. 18 : 20."

2. In the second place, the word of God in the worship of the Church is both sacrament and sacrifice, it is at the same time the word of God and the word of His Church. This is most clearly seen in the Holy Scriptures. These books are either histories or historical documents. They are marked by the idiosyncrasies of those who wrote them; they are addressed to particular persons, and many of them were called forth by particular occasions; and, though, inasmuch as they deal with eternal and universal truths, they always are fresh and intelligible, they say most and speak most clearly to those who know the age in which they were written and are able to enter into sympathy with their authors and first readers. When our

Gospels first found their place in the regular worship of the Church, they were known as *Memorabilia of the Apostles*, and it was impossible for the first age to read them without sympathetic recollection of those holy men who first taught them by word of mouth. The Canon of Holy Scripture is the word of God given through the Church, by the Church treasured, sifted, acknowledged, arranged, preserved. It is her confession. It is at once God's word to her and the answer of her consciousness, like the Psalter in the Old Testament; the Shepherd's voice and the immediate response of His sheep who know His voice. So, further, as Kliefoth reminds us (iv. 102), the sermon is on the one side an explanation of God's word, and on the other hand a confession and testimony of the preacher and the congregation. "If the congregation sing, it does not pray only, but teaches and preaches to itself the word of God; and in the same hymn the prayer and supplication and praise can go on at the very same time as the mutual preaching and admonition. Here are both the sacrificial and the sacramental elements in the hymn. In the sacrament, we have the heavenly gift on the one side, and the thanksgiving and praise on the other."

3. It is to be noted that the Holy Scriptures are used in the worship of the Church as one indivisible organic revelation. There are diversities in the Canon, to which we shall have occasion to revert, an Old Testament and a New, Gospels and Epistles, Songs and Prose. But these distinctions are fused in the Church's liturgical use of Holy Scripture. She does not make a distinction between what was said in one age and what belongs to another, or present the parts of the Bible as a body of materials to be sifted, out of which each is for himself to construct a faith. The Old Testament is seen "in the light of the New." It is interpreted by the New. It is valued as a key to the fulfilment of it of which the New is an account. Its history is typical; its worship is the background; and its glorious songs become Christian prayers and hymns. The New Testament is not a thing *to be studied* in the worship of the Church in the expectation that it can make any change of its belief. The use of the Holy Scriptures is dominated by the

Church's creed; every part and text is interpreted according to the analogy of faith. In its worship this wonderful literature of many ages, many minds, many lands, becomes one word and one confession, telling but one thing—the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ,—one confession, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

This absolute dominion of the *one faith* and the requirements of common worship, render it necessary that Christian worship, that it may be decent, should have an *order*, and that it should be directed by those who are "regularly called."

NOTE.—*Clem. Alex. Strom.*, vi. 15: "The Apostles accordingly say of the Lord, that He spake all things in parables, &c. (Matt. 13: 34); and if all things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made, consequently also prophecy and law were made by Him, and were spoken by Him in parables. But all things are right, says the Scripture, before those who understand, Prov. 8: 9, that is, those who receive and observe, according to the ecclesiastical rule, the exposition of the Scriptures explained by Him; and the ecclesiastical rule (*κανων*) is the concord and harmony of the law and the prophets in the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord." See also Harnack, *Hy. of Doctrine* (Eng.) I. 292. Ib. 156, "The Old Testament revelations and oracles were regarded as pointing to Christ; the Old Testament itself, the words of God spoken by the prophets, as the primitive gospel of salvation, having in view the new people, which is, however, the oldest, and belonging to it alone. The exposition of the Old Testament, which, as a rule, was of course read in the Alexandrian Canon of the Bible, turned it into a Christian book." Ib. 176 n. "With the help of the Old Testament the teachers dated back the Christian religion to the beginning of the human race, and joined the preparations for the founding of the Christian community with the creation of the world. The Apologists were not the first to do so, for Barnabas and Hermas, and before these Paul, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and others had already done the same. This was undoubtedly to the cultivated classes one of the most impressive articles in the missionary preaching." Nüsgen finds the pattern for this in one Lord—*Gesch. d. N. T., Offenbarung*, I. 274. Wie schon bei der Besprechung der Wunder Jesu sich herausstellte, war es durch die Gesamtheit der Weissagung bezeugte Vorhaben einer vollkommenden Erlösung, auf das Jesus hinklickte, wenn er von der Erfüllung der Propheten sprach (vgl. Matt. 11: 3; Luke 4: 16 ss.). Wie beim Gesetz beschäftigte ihn auch bei der Prophetie die Erfüllung des einzigen Wortes nur, sofern dieses ein Moment in dem Vorhaben Gottes für die Zukunft überhaupt enthielt und aussprach. Erst wenn man das im Auge behält, so wird Jesus

Art, auf Einzelnes im A. T. als Typus und Weissagung neutestamentliche Vorgänge zu berufen, völlig klar."

Diessel, Gesch. des A. T. in der Christlichen Kirche, 1, says: Mit dem Kämpfe gegen die häretische Gnosis erwächst dem altkathol. Vätern die Pflicht, die Einheit der Testamente zu erhärten, während zugleich die Schriftauslegung selbst als zweifelhafte Stütze erkannt wird. Der Satz von der Symphonie aller Offenbarung prägt sich aus in der exegetischen Norm der Glaubensregel, in der Herrschaft der Lehrtradition über die Auslegung. * * *

Christus erscheint besonders auf dem Boden deutscher Reformation, als der Mittelpunkt der schrift. Denn als Ganzes war sie überliefert: so ist Christus nicht nur Ende, sondern auch Centrum des A. T. Und wie mit dem Zusammenfallen der theokratischen Kirchenidee das gesetzliche Moment zurücktrat, so war es nur folgerichtig, das A. T. ausschliesslich als prophetische Schrift zu betrachten. * * * Auf lutherischem Boden erfährt die Schrift wohl die höchste Ehre, darf aber nur die feststehende Doctrin beglaubigen." *Tert. adv. Prax.* 11. Fere omnes (Psalmi) Christi personam sustinent, Christum ad Deum verba facientem repraesentabant. *Diessel* again 6. 5. Man griff zu den Haupt-schlüssel — der apostolischen Ueberlieferung, in der man den Christlichen Gemeingeist in seiner vollen Reinheit erblickte. Man glaubte dieselbe fixiren zu können in der Glaubensregel; sie wird das Masz der Auslegung." Origen is quoted: "Omnis paene hostia, quae offertur, habet aliquid formae et imaginis Christi. Justin, Ap. 32. Christ is the interpreter of the prophesies. Uee also Rev. 19: 10.

"Jesus hatte bei seiner Verkündigung auf Erden beständig an die alttestamentliche Vorstufe der Offenbarung angeknüpft." Nüsgen, II. 436.

4. The word of God in the worship of the Church has not a magical efficacy. It is not used as an incantation. It is efficient only as God's *revelation* to men; it is addressed to intelligent men. For this reason, it has no sense, unless in the vernacular. It is an abuse to say it in the Christian assembly in an undertone, as *secreta*. Our forefathers rightly demanded that, according to its nature and purpose, it should be said to the congregation (not to or over inanimate things) and in a tongue they could understand.

5. But while the Church from the first recognized the unity of the word of God which speaks to us through the Holy Scriptures, she did not lose sight of the distinctions within them. There were three elements, Prophecy, the Testimony of the inspired Church, and the words of the Saviour Himself, and she

emphasized this by the different respect she paid to the Old Testament, the Epistles of the Apostles, and the Gospel. She was built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief cornerstone.

II.

I propose to examine with you *the manner in which the word of God is set forth in the worship of the Church.*

The worship of the Church consists of certain fixed parts which are found in every complete service but give a varying sense according as certain variable parts are supplied. The Confession, the Introit, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the collect, the Lessons, Creed and Sermon, the Prayer, the Holy Supper, are the outline of the service. Let us at first confine our attention to the framework of the service.

The element of Christian Worship which was first historically and is still first in importance, is the Holy Eucharist. It will not be denied that the celebration of the Holy Supper was the characteristic of the earliest distinctively Christian Worship. In those first days when the Apostles and brethren still went up to the temple to pray, it was the distinctively Christian service when believers met *to break bread* together; and when, shortly afterwards, they spoke in the synagogues or disputed in the schools or exhorted from house to house, when those who had become believers actually gathered for the service of worship which answered to to their fellowship, it was to break bread with the Lord. The earliest Christian documents agree with the description which Pliny gives of the worship of the Church.

You will recall that St. Paul says of this that it is a proclamation of the death of Christ. This dictum of his applies not to the words of Institution repeated in the Service only, but extends to the whole of it: As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth, proclaim (*καταγγέλετε*), the Lord's death till he come. It was primarily, then, a proclamation of the Lord's death; of the fact of His death; and, inasmuch as it was celebrated by those who did it at His command and in remembrance of Him, who called to mind all that be-

longed to the Institution of the Supper, it was a confession and proclamation of the Nature and Effect of that death. It was their Passover, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, a participation in the sacrifice that atoned for their sins, the Great High Priest meanwhile sprinkling His Blood in heaven and making intercession for them. The Holy Supper fulfilled our Lord's parting injunction in the Gospel of Luke, to preach in His name remission of sins among all nations. In it the Blood bears witness.

NOTE.—Here it is significant that the Ancient Church prayed for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the elements. Through them, as through the written word, He bears witness. Thus *Lit. St. James*: "Accept them * * * and send Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice—the Spirit that is witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus—that He may declare this bread the body of Thy Christ, and this cup the blood of Thy Christ: that all who partake thereof may be confirmed in godliness and obtain remission of sins: may be delivered from the devil and his errors: may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and being made worthy of Christ and reconciled to Thee, O Lord God Almighty, may obtain eternal life." So also the Clementine. The *Lit. St. Mark* says, "Send the Paraclete Himself, holy, powerful, and life-giving, the Spirit of truth, who spake in the Lord, the apostles, and the prophets * * * send upon us also, and upon this bread, and upon these chalices, Thy Holy Spirit, &c."

I have said, the Holy Supper declared more than the *fact* of our Lord's death. Much more was comprised in the declaration of His death than any age of the Church has comprehended. It is well-known that the explanation we give of the Atonement by the blood of Christ was not familiar in the earlier ages of the Church, although now it seems to us that the texts of Holy Scripture cannot be made to bear any other sense than the "Satisfaction" that was excogitated by Anselm and the substitution-theory of later divines; but before these were explanations, which, puerile as they appear, answered to the tone of mind of those days. Throughout this progress of opinion, and leading forward to the complete apprehension of truth, the Holy Supper has declared *the death of Christ* and laid that fact at the basis of Christian Worship, hope and life. It has helped the Church to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified, to glory in the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified unto us and we are crucified to the world.

But the Holy Supper declared much more than *the death of Christ*. The words of St. Paul, while they establish our position that the Holy Supper is a *showing-forth* of the Gospel, do not confine its message to His death. Those are wrong who make it only a sad memorial of the crucifixion. This do, our Lord said, In remembrance of Me. It will be found, I think, that the Christians of the first ages customarily regarded it as an anamnesis of the Incarnation of our Lord even more than of His death.

NOTE.—Sunday was a commemoration of creation as well as of Redemption. Cf. Harn. DG. II. 178: "By expounding pure Monotheism and giving it the main place in his argument, Aristides gave supreme prominence to the very doctrine which simple Christians prized as most important." Ib. 255. "Like the Apologists, the early Catholic Fathers confess that the doctrine of God the Creator is the first and most important of the main articles of the Christian faith." To this moment may be due the use of the first verses of the Gospel of St. John at the close of the Roman Mass. See *Liturgy of St. Mark*, XVI. "For truly heaven and earth are full of Thy glory, through the manifestation of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ." "While we show forth the death of Thine only begotten Son our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and acknowledge His blessed resurrection on the third day, we do openly declare His ascension into heaven, and His sitting on the right hand of Thee, God and Father, and await His second terrible and dreadful coming, &c." Mel. *Ex. Ord.* 62. Secundo accedat Gratiarum actio pro filii missione, pro assumptione humane nature, pro redemptione, pro donatione Evangelii, pro vivificatione, quae fit per ipsum et Spiritum sanctum, pro restitutione vitae eterne, pro collectione ecclesiae. Utrumque complectitur Dominus, videlicet, confirmationem Fidei, et Gratiarum actionem, cum inquit: Hoc facite in mei recordationem. Compare App. Const., VII., 39.

There were reasons for this. While Jewish Christians might find in it the antitype of their Passover belonging to the new people of God (1 Thess. 1 : 1), Gentile believers, however they may have been led to share in those principles of fellowship with God by continual use of the Old Testament Scriptures, were apt to think more of the falsehoods and uncertainties about Creation and Providence from which they had been delivered by the Gospel (Acts 14 : 15, 17). They delighted in the knowledge of the One True God,—in the First Article of the Creed as it was mediated to them by the Second—and in the assurance that our great God and Saviour had come down into

His Creation for us. God our Maker, our God, God made flesh, God imparting Himself to us in His creatures of bread and wine presented as representative of His whole varied creation, these were, or quickly became, and by a pure and genuine development of truth, the main thoughts of the worshipers. The first controversies, traces of which are found even in the Scriptures, were about these points—as to our Lord's Godhead, as to the reality of His Incarnation, as to His relation to the creation,—Ebionism, Docetism, Gnosticism, Arianism show how real this question was and justify the central witness of the blood which the early Church perceived in the Holy Supper.

The same argument extends to every element of the Gospel. We shall show how the churchly use of the Holy Scriptures brings out this fulness of the declaration of God's word by the Holy Supper; which, moreover, is served by the *Prefaces* in the Communion.

The Holy Supper was a common meal of Christian fellowship. Its nature, its institution, the thirteenth of John, its repetition, the care with which those not entitled to it were excluded, the reservation of the blessed elements for the absent, the use of it as a mark of recognition and brotherhood, all show that it was intended to declare the *unity* of the Christian believers. It was a sign of fellowship, and a declaration of it. It was a *communion*; a communion of each with all; of all with one another; of all and each with Christ, and set forth the Gospel of our Lord's sacerdotal prayer. The Church is right in regarding it as a ceremony in which she takes part as a *whole*, in communion, in mystic union, with her Head, offering herself in His offering, pleading with His intercession (Heb. 4 : 16), and bearing the burden of the general want and of the lack and woe of each with Him.

NOTE.—*Didache. Apology.*

Compare also the prayer in the Liturgies for the descent of the Holy Ghost *on us*.

Cyprian Ep. LXII. As many grains, collected, and ground, and mixed together in one mass, make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly head, we may know there is one body, with which our number is joined and united. Ep. LXXV. When the Lord calls bread, which

VOL. XXVII. No. 3.

49

is combined by the union of many grains, His body, He indicates our people whom He bore as being united; and when He calls the wine, which is pressed from many grapes and clusters collected together, His blood, He also signifies one flock linked together by the mingling of a united multitude. Aug. on Ps. LI. : 21. Not even we have been left without a sacrifice to offer to God. Whence shall we propitiate Him? Offer; certainly in thyself thou hast what thou mayest offer. Do not from without fetch frankincense, but say, In me are, O God, Thy vows. I will render praise to Thee. Do not from without seek cattle to slay, thou hast in thyself what thou mayest kill. The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit. On Ps. CXXXI. He prayeth in the temple of God, who prayeth in the peace of the Church, in the unity of Christ's Body; which Body of Christ consisteth of many who believe in the whole world."

Dict. Christian Biog. II. 252. "It should be noted that in this passage, the phrase 'Corpus Christi' bears two senses, not one. In other words, Christ has two bodies: one with which He was born and rose, the other which is the aggregate of His elect people: or His mystical body, called the Church. Of these the latter owes all its life to the first: yet so, that participation in the life bestowed by the first is limited to those who compose the last. The act of the Holy Ghost at the font engrafts men members of the last; and then, subsequently, the act of the Holy Ghost at the altar supplies them with the first to be their food through life? For we, being many, are one bread—one body—for we are all partakers of that one bread': as the apostle says. And this, as St. Augustine teaches, is also symbolized in the Eucharist: 'Unus panis: quis est iste unus panis? Unum corpus multi. Recolite quia panis non sit de uno grano, sed de multis * * * et sic de vino. Fratres, recolite unde sit vinum. Grana multa pendent ad botrum: sed liquor granorum in unitate confunditur. Ita et Dominus Christus nos significavit, nos ad se pertinere voluit, mysterium pacis et unitatis nostrae in sua mensa consecravit.'" (Senn. CCXXXII., ed. Ben.)

Nösgen, *Gesch. d. N. T. Offb'g.* II. 459. Die Offenbarung kennt keine anderen Rauchopfer als die Gebete der Heiligen (5 : 8; 8 : 3, 4), und die Gemeinde der Treuen, der bewährten Christen, welche auch nicht bloß eine bevorzugte Klasse unter den Gläubigen ist, sondern diese sämtlich umfaßt, bildet selber die dem Gott und dem Lamme angenehme Erstlingsgarbe aus der Welt (14 : 4)."

The Holy Supper is a sacrificial meal. We must remember that not only were the first Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, familiar with sacrificial usages; they were not able to think the thoughts which belong to religion in any other forms. The disciples of our Lord had taken part in peace- and thank-offerings in the Temple, and their feasts had been sacraments. The Pass-

over was a sacramental feast, bringing the assurance of God's merciful care. The Holy Supper was a sacrificial feast, sealing to those partaking of it in faith forgiveness, acceptance, reconciliation, grace, reception into fellowship with God and His people, in spite of the sin which the atoning Death it declared had covered. "There can be no doubt," says Melancthon, *Ex. Ord.*, (23.) 57; "that the sacraments are an application to individual persons of the promise offered to all; as Paul says, Circumcision was the seal of righteousness, *i. e.* an assertion of the promise and a pledge of the application of it."

NOTE.—It is not wonderful that the Bread and Wine in the story of Melchizedek is so often made to point to the Holy Supper, Westcott on Heb. p. 201 says, "He presents, and we cannot but believe He purposely presents, Melchizedek as priest, not in sacrificing but in blessing, that is, in communicating the fruits of an efficacious sacrifice already made."

Westcott on Heb. 3: 14, quotes *Primasius*: Christo participamus et jungimur utpote unum et in illo existentes; siquidem hoc participamus illi quia ipse caput nostrum et nos membra illius, cohaerentes et concorporales illi secundum spiritalem hominem, qui creatus est in illo. In eo etiam participamus, quia corpus et sanguinem ejus sumimus ad redemptionem nostram.

We may learn a great deal from a comparison of the different formulas which were proposed for the Exhortation in the Holy Communion in the XVI. Century. In ours, which is taken from the Nuremberg form of 1525, it is said 1. That He hath had mercy upon us and taken upon Himself our nature; 2. That He hath fulfilled for us the whole will and law of God; 3. That for us and our salvation He has suffered death and all that we by our sins have deserved. In the original Oslander says, "After Supper He took the Bread, gave thanks, brake and said, This is my Body, given for you; as if to say, That I became man, and all that I do and suffer, all is yours, done for you and for your good; and as a certain proof of it I give you my Body to eat. After the same manner He took the Cup and said, Take it and drink ye all of it; This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. As often as ye do this, ye do it in remembrance of me. As if to say, Because I took upon me your nature and have taken upon me your sin, I will offer myself to death for sin, will pour out my Blood to purchase grace and forgiveness of sin, and thus institute a new covenant, in which sin shall be remembered no more. As a certain proof of this I give you my Blood to drink." *Antwerp* 1567, says, "The Holy Supper renders us certain of our union with Christ and eventual participation in His glory." *Meck-*

lenburg says, "In testimony that even to you this grace is given and applied, ye are to take the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to know that for you the Lord Christ was offered on the Cross, and gave His Body for you; and that the Lord Christ maketh you members of His Body and will show forth His power in you."

The Holy Supper was in the conception of the early Church a Thankoffering, a Thanksgiving, the Eucharist. How could it be anything else to those who appreciated their deliverance out of the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of God's love? By this name it was called. And when we remember how Paul exhorts his converts to unremitted thanksgivings, and speaks of services being valuable as causing *thanksgivings* to God, and consider how he joins all prayer with thanksgivings, and uses in connection with thanksgiving terms which are elsewhere so closely associated with the Holy Eucharist, it is difficult to believe that the Holy Supper was not called by this name in the days of the Apostles. And the Eucharist of the first Christians was not merely a saying of thanks. Their thanksgiving was a thankoffering. They *offered* bread and wine (accustomed to this by bloodless offerings in the temple as well as by Gentile customs in worship), and these were representative of all God's gifts in creation, intended to say, All that we have is Thine; and through and with them they gave themselves in thanksgiving. If the Lord gave His Body, if He gave His Body by means of His creature, so did He also make them His Body, and they offered to Him His Body, the Church.

NOTE—See especially 2 Cor. 4 : 15; 9 : 11, 12; Phil. 4 : 6; 1 Cor. 14 : 16.

Luther (quoted in Kliefoth IV. 63), says, Darum sollen wir des Worts Opfer wohl wahrnehmen, dasz wir nicht vermessen Etwas Gott zu geben in dem Sacrament, so er mit darinnen alle Dinge giebt. Wir sollen geistlich opfern, dieweil die leiblichen Opfer abgegangen, und in Kirchen, Klöster, Spitalgüter verwandelt sind. Was sollen wir denn opfern? uns selbst uns Alles was wir haben mit fleiszigem Gebet, wie wir sagen: Dein Wille geschehe auf Erden als im Himmel. Hiemit wir uns dargeben sollen göttlichem Willen, dasz es von und aus uns mache, was er will nach seinem göttlichen Wohlgefallen; dazu ihm Lob und Dank opfern, aus ganzem Herzen, für seine unaussprechliche süsse Gnade und Barmherzigkeit, die er uns in diesem Sacrament zugesagt und gegeben hat. Und Wiewohl solch Opfer auch auszer der Messe

geschieht und geschehen soll, denn es nicht nöthig und wesentlich zur Messe gehört, wie gesagt ist; so ist's doch köstlicher, füglicher, stärker und auch angenehmer, wo es mit dem Haufen und in der Sammlung geschieht, da Eines das Andere reizt, bewegt, und erhitzt, dasz es stark zu Gott dringt, und damit erlangt ohne allen Zweifel was es will.

So the Holy Supper is a showing forth of the Gospel, from the Incarnation of the Son of God till He is delivered for our offenses and raised again for our justification, of His exaltation to the Right Hand of God and His perpetual intercession for us. It declares also the reality of His Church, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, our blessed fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, whose blood cleanses us from all sins.

2

The Word of God is declared in Christian Worship also in the use of the Holy Scriptures. The Lessons, the Creed and the Sermon belong together. In the Epistle and Gospel an appropriate part of the word of God is read; by the use of the Creed it is properly set in its relation to the whole Gospel; and in the Sermon it is "rightly divided," that is, explained and applied to individual persons and the occasion.

From the beginning the Old Testament was read in the Christian assemblies. Jews were accustomed to this in the synagogue, and those of heathen origin adopted the custom. These searched the Scriptures because they testified of Christ. How diligent use they made of them is shown by the abundant citations and comments of the earliest apologists; and I am inclined to the belief that the prophets of the apostolic period were men who were enabled by the Spirit to open the sense of the Old Testament and show Christ in it. The Old Testament interpretation of the Apologists and the extended address of the *Preface* to the communion in the earliest liturgies may be an example of such prophetic utterance. Such a use of sacred books in worship was new to the majority of those who became Christians. Their manner of using them throws light on the estimation in which they held the Apostolic writings when these had gradually come into existence, were adopted in the service

of the Church, and were made a Canon on a plane with the Old Testament. The Old Testament Scriptures were regarded rather as prophecy and a record of types, than as history. Their use in Christian worship is witnessed by Justin Martyr and persisted in the chief service until the time of Augustine. We find an Old Testament lection in the Mozarabic Mass, and in the Gallican Mass up to 600 A. D., and in the Ambrosian Mass still used occasionally in Milan; and Augustine expressly makes the Psalm after the Epistle the representative of it.

NOTE.—Justin Apol. I. 30, 53, 61. Tryph. 119. Ep. Barn. 9. Klieforth III. 371.

Diestel § 5. 1. Das A. T. ist der einzige Massgebende Norm der Kirche bis zur Zeit der grossen katholischen Väter, mochten auch andere Schriften rein christlichen Ursprungs daneben gebraucht werden und in Ansehen stehen. 3. Doch schwebte bei diesen Ideen den Kirchenvätern stets eine solche Anschauung vom A. T. vor, welche alle progressiven Elemente stark hervorhebt und alles rein Zeitliche als episodisch und als von den Propheten selber gewollte erkannte.

§6. 2. Dass das richtige schriftverständniss durch die Erkenntniss des Erfüllungscharakters im Christenthume bedingt sei, spricht sich in der Behauptung aus, dass die biblische Gnosis ein Charisma sei, eine von Gott den Christen gegebene Gnade * * * Die Ewigkeit des Christenthumes *a parte post* fordert das Gleiche *a parte ante* zu constatiren; alle göttliche Wahrheit muss in sich eine und identische sein.

We may be sure that the story of what Christ did and taught and the application of it to the conduct of believers formed a part of the usual worship of the Church from the first. The testimony of eyewitnesses, of those who had heard their testimony, the "teaching" of the Apostles or the "tradition" or "charge" they gave to their converts, the comment of prophets and teachers, and finally written records and Apostolic letters, filled this place. Eastman (*Principles of Divine Service* I. I., 332) finds the place set for the Gospel in the account of the Institution of the Last Supper in the Gospel of St. John: "After the commandment to love one another, the Saviour proceeded at once to unfold the objective Faith, which was to be the stay and solace of the world till He should come again. This was His Gospel, the detailed announcement of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and of their several offices henceforth towards man (St.

John 14 : 1-26)." Nösgen (Gesch. d. N. T. Offenbarung, I. 146) says of the Gospel of Matthew, "This presentation from the pen of an eyewitness appeared to be a complete substitute for oral testimony to the story of the Lord. Its compass, and its combination of the deeds and words of the Lord, was for earliest Christianity an embodiment of the witness of the first disciples to their Master. This led to the general use of this book, written before the destruction of Jerusalem, and made it the weightiest book ever written. In it the Lord spoke directly to His people, as the Apostles spoke to them through their letters."

This marks the real principle of the distinction that always has been made in the worship of the Church, between the Epistles and the Gospels. The former were known as *the Apostle*; the latter are first called, *The Memorabilia of the Apostles*. The Epistles, as Bernard says (*The Progress of Doctrine in the N. T.*) are "the voice of the Spirit within the Church to those who are within it;" the Gospel is the voice of the Master Himself. At the Gospel the congregation stood, at the time of the writing of the earliest books of the *Apostolic Constitutions*; in aftertime the Epistle was read from a lower pulpit; and the Gospel was set about with prayers and responses, some of which are retained in our own service.

NOTE.—Justin, *Ap.* I. 67; Rev. †=3; Herm. Vis. II. 4; Dionys. Cor. in Eus. IV, 23, 11. See Harnack, DG. II. 41, 42. App. CC. II. 57; Kliefoth III. 306, 7; V. 32-34.

Attendere autem Prophetis, praecipue vero Evangelio, in quo passio nobis ostensa est, et resurrectio perfecta est. Ign. Smyrn. VII. See Phil. IX.

At first it was the prerogative of the Bishop to select the passages of Holy Scripture to be read. At a very early period certain sections were assigned to certain days. A letter of Jerome is preserved, which Ranke (E. Ranke, *Das Perikopensystem*, &c., 262) traces back to 1000 A. D., which forms an introduction to his *Comes*, in which he made an arrangement of passages of Holy Scripture for the Seasons and Days of the Christian Year, intended to be "A companion to life and a luminous heart of the Bible;" and in which he was careful to treasure the usages, and the order of reading the Scriptures,

and the connecting ideas, which he found in the Churches. As the *Comes* of Jerome may therefore have been a revised thesaurus of the usage which had gradually formed itself in the Church up to his time, so without doubt it has remained the core of the lectionary that has come down to us through the revisions of Charlemagne and the Reformers.

3.

But not only in the Holy Eucharist and the Lessons from Holy Scripture, as they are interpreted by the Creed and explained and applied in the Sermon, is the Word of God, the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, set forth the worship of the Church. The very structure of the Service is a declaration of the Word of God. By the Confession and Absolution with which it opens, as well as by its central celebration of the atoning death of Christ, and by its repeated absolution—in the declaration of grace, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Sermon, the Pax, the Benediction,—it teaches that the only way of access to the Father is through the death of Christ for the sins of the world. Throughout the Service we are suppliants—conscious sinners, yet sons of God by grace, equally assured of our infinite need and confident of God's infinite grace. Upon this is based every prayer. And these prayers are said in the unity of the Body of Christ and in virtue of His perfect sacrifice.

4.

We need not linger to show how the Word of God is declared also in the *hymns* of the Service. St. Paul had enjoined the Christians of Colossae to teach and admonish one another in Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. The educative use of holy song was keenly recognized in the Reformation. Perhaps in no way is Christian truth more impressed on the minds of the simple. In hours of intense inward struggle all of us have derived strength from the Word of God condensed into a line of a hymn. We should recognize the preaching office of sacred song. In it we do not only confess to God, but preach to one another, to the children, to the world. Our hymns should be

pure and true, and the use of the Psalter, arranged and interpreted by the Gospel, must be characteristic of Christian Worship.

5.

But I cannot leave unmentioned another means of the proclamation of the word of God in our worship—I mean *in the prayers of the Church*, first in their structure and composition, and then in their words. The *Litany*, for instance, in its direct address to Christ teaches His Divinity, as in its obsecrations it declares the direct reference to us of everything He is and did. The *Bidding Prayer* emphasizes the presence in the world of a fellowship which is the Body of the Risen Lord, which shares His mission and breathes His spirit of love and fills up what was lacking of His sufferings. The use of the Lord's Prayer assures us of our welcome to that fellowship and puts us into right relation to our Heavenly Father. And the structure of the Collects, based as they are on an Attribute or some definite word of God, and pleading the name and promise of the Lord Jesus Christ, and claiming the particular gift which belongs to each declaration of the Gospel in its turn, is an exhaustless setting-forth and analysis of the exhaustless Revelation of God to men in our Lord Jesus Christ.

They teach the spirit in which we ought to pray, and that our prayers should be for one another. They set forth what the experience of the Church under the guidance of the word of God shows the burden of her prayers should be. Prayer is natural. Misery cries out of itself. But Christian prayer is more than natural. It is a gift of God. We pray as we do, because we are taught to pray thus. Our prayer is not a mere cry; it is an affectionate trustful answer to the grace of God given and avouched to us in our Lord Jesus Christ. This book in the hands of our children, and the reverent use of it through many years, teaches what God wants us to know about prayer, and about the Hearer and Answerer of prayer.

What, for instance, do the Collects teach about the nature of

God? First, that we address God who has revealed Himself in our Lord Jesus Christ. We do not call Him the Supreme Being, the Great First Cause, the Architect of the Universe; or use similar high-sounding titles by which those who seek to avoid a precise acknowledgment of His truth only try to veil a denial of Him. The Collects teach the doctrine of the Trinity. They teach the Divinity of our Lord. They teach the doctrine of the Atonement. See how much of the Gospel they put into our hearts: It is "He who gave His eternal Son to be made incarnate of a pure Virgin," and made Christmas Eve "to shine with the brightness of the true Light," and "made His Son subject to the Law." "By the leading of a star He manifested His Only-begotten Son to the Gentiles;" "in His glorious Transfiguration He confirmed the mysteries of the faith by the testimony of the fathers and did foreshow the adoption of sons;" and He sent Him in our flesh "to suffer death upon the cross that all mankind should follow the example of His great humility." Christ "overcame death, and opened unto us the gate of everlasting life." "By the humiliation of His Son God raised up a fallen world, and showed unto them that be in error the light of His truth to the intent that they may return into the way of righteousness." "He never fails to help those whom He brings up in his steadfast fear and love." Though "without Him they are not able to please Him," by His gift His faithful people do unto Him true and laudable service." How wonderfully do the Collects repeat the Creed and confess the Gospel. They put the knowledge of the Most High into the hearts of the children of the Church, not as an empty formula, but as the means of faith and prayer, and an instrument of comfort and power.

They teach us much more about God. He "knows us to be set in the midst of so many and great dangers, that by reason of the frailty of our nature we cannot always stand upright." He sees "that we put not our trust in anything that we do." He hates "nothing that He has made and forgives the sins of all who are penitent." He "sees we have no strength," and "is the strength of all them that put their trust in Him." He is "the

Author and Giver of all good things." "His never-failing providence orders all things both in heaven and earth." His Almighty Power "He declares chiefly in showing mercy and pity." "He is more ready to hear than we to pray, and is wont to give more than either we desire or deserve," and therefore is "Our Refuge and Strength." Surely here is the Christian theology. He who prays these prayers, and grounds his petitions on this faith in God, has what he asks for, and "serves God with a quiet mind." By teaching us whom we are speaking to, and putting into our lips a right faith in Him, God's Spirit takes the first step to help our infirmities and teach us what things we should pray for as we ought.

NOTE.—The Collects, the utterance of the faith of the Church in all ages, which has been begotten in her by the Holy Spirit through the word, are, like all the other parts of the Service, but perhaps in a greater degree, the continued testimony of the Church—the word of God *living* in the Church; the proof that the Comforter brings to mind all that Jesus did and said and leads into all the truth; our witness, and His witness with us.

6.

But not half of the office of our worship in showing forth the word of the Lord is shown, so long as we consider only the unchanging parts of the service, which we have called the *consonants*; it is by means of the variable parts, the *vowels*, that the whole compass of the revelation of God is presented, in its fulness and its organic completeness. As the old service-books will show, the worship of the Church is conceived as a distinct whole on every separate Sunday or Festival. The Introit, the Collect, the Epistle, the Gospel, the Responses, the Hymn, the Preface, the Communion, are selected and arranged to set forth in order *first*, the essential facts on which salvation is based, and *secondly*, the essential traits of the teaching of Christ. It is not as if all this had been prearranged. The Introits have their own history, the Collects theirs, the Gospels and Epistles followed an independent development, and the Prefaces again had their own beginning and their own periods of reformation. But we speak of the Service as we have it; and, with such qualification as we shall

immediately offer, we may say that the variable parts of the Service are so related to each other that, set with the fixed parts, the Service on each Sunday presents a distinct gift to faith and lesson to conduct, and in the course of the year takes us through a complete review of the Gospel of Christ. Although there is some variation in the arrangement of Introits, Gospels, Epistles and Collects, so that between the First Sunday after Trinity and Advent we differ from the Roman Church, and between the Third Sunday after Trinity and Advent we differ from the Anglican Church, the order observed in our book accords with the old use back to the time of Charlemagne. And, we may add, that order and these constituents of it abide as a testimony to the kernel of truth which was in the Church in spite of the usurpations of Rome and the abuses of the times. No one can be familiar with the Roman Breviary without having been struck by the immense contrast between the *propria* of the Saints' Days and the *propria* of the Sundays and Christian Festivals, and the parts which belong to the Fasts and those where there was no temptation to interject Romish error. A skillful man can easily do what our reformers did—loosen and pull out from the delicate organism the parts which plead a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, the merits of human service, and the worship of creatures, and leave unhurt in all its native and renewed force the wonderful declaration of the Gospel which Christian worship has grown to be in the life of the people of God.

We must indeed confess that it is not *always* possible to account for *all* the parts of the Service and to show their mutual pertinence. This, partly because our times and our habits of thought are so different from the periods in which they were selected. We occupy a different stage of knowledge of Scripture and its doctrine. For some days, no doubt, better selections might be found; as Luther arranged an appropriate ending to the Church Year instead of the awkward recourse to the Epiphany Sundays which the Anglicans retain. Yet you are to heed these words of Augustine: "Not indeed all things which are told must be thought to have a special significance, but they are added for the sake of those which *do* mean something. So

the ground is torn only by the ploughshare, but the other parts of the plough are necessary to it; and though only the strings of a harp give forth sound, the other parts of the instrument are needed, though the player never strikes them. They resound, because these hold them together."

In the Great Festivals, with their seasons of preparation and succeeding Sundays, are shown forth the essential facts of the Creed, independently of the particular selections of Scripture which belong to them and in sublime disregard of all the debate of critics as to the exact text of the original manuscripts. The Incarnation, the Miraculous Birth, the Manifestation, the Sacrificial Death, the Resurrection, the Ascension to the Right Hand of God, and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit are confessed and proclaimed in the life and worship of the Church, which thus bears witness to and with the Scriptures and to that interpretation of them which accords with the faith once delivered to the saints.

The other part of the Church Year also has significance. It signalizes the application of the Word of God in the history of the world. As it is demonstrable that every Sunday in the former and great half of the year has its own character and voice, yet is best understood in its connection with other days in the Easter-cycle, or Christmas-cycle, for instance, so history shows us that the Sundays after Trinity (known in the Church of Rome as *Sundays after Pentecost*) were first grouped around certain days observed in the Western Church, derived their character from that relation, and are to be studied in it. They were known as Sundays before and after the *day of Peter and Paul*, June 29th, *St. Lawrence*, the deacon and treasurer of Rome, Aug. 10th, and *St. Michael and All Angels*, Sept. 29; and accordingly they are arranged to show the lessons which belong

1. to the gathering of the Church and the formation of the Christian life;
2. to the life of the Church and the progress of Christian character;
3. to the Church Triumphant and the goal of the Christian faith.

I propose to illustrate this by a more detailed examina-

tion of the *propria* of these Sundays, the manner in which all the *propria* converge upon one lesson, or one datum of faith. Let us take two instances in which the correspondence is not immediately apparent, the 9th and the 16th Sundays after Trinity. On the *Ninth Sunday after Trinity* the Collect, Epistle and Gospel agree in the rebuke of a worldly mind and a recognition of its temptations. The Introit emphasizes the sole but certain resource. And if you turn to the daily lessons you will find that though they belong to the continuous reading of the Bible, they refer to the right use of the things of this world and the choice of wisdom above everything else. On the *Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity* the Introit is the cry of a trustful soul to God. It expresses a sense of the deepest need. It also asserts an experience of the Lord's goodness, longsuffering and mercy. The Collect asks that the grace of God may compass us about, "go before" and "follow after" us, and present "us unbrokenly intent on good works." The Epistle is one of Paul's prayers for his converts (Eph. 3 : 13-21), in which he asks that they may rise to the apprehension of the love of Christ and be filled unto all the fulness of God. The Gospel is the story of the raising to life of the widow of Nain's son. The keynote of the day is Eph. 3 : 20, Unto Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us. The Gospel illustrates this : To the widow the Lord says, Weep not. He answers her natural surprise with a manifestation of the wonderful power God has given unto men, which, operating in the dead man, raises him to life. It is the assurance that if Paul could ask the stupendous thing written in the Epistle, God is able to do it; and the power that worketh in us, which raised a dead man to life, is great enough, going before and following after us, to make us to be given to all good works.

In studying the pericope for a Sunday it always is well to consider the light which the daily lessons throw upon it. Those for the Saturday before, and the Monday after, the 16th Sunday, have been chosen on the general principle of *lectio continua*, modified by the churchly distribution of the books of the Bible among the Christian Seasons. The morning lessons which pre-

pare for the Sunday Gospel and continue its gift are, 1. the assurance that, though we are in danger of missing the promises of God, our forerunner, Jesus, a highpriest forever after the order of Melchizedek, is for us entered within the veil (Heb. 6 : 1-20), and, 2. that He is able to save unto the uttermost those who come unto God by Him (Heb. 7 : 1-28); and the Old Testament lessons for the Evening are Jer. 25 : 1-14 and 37 : 1-21, 1. Promise in the midst of darkness, and, 2. Warning against the vanity of depending on any other than God. How beautifully do these lessons serve the Epistle and Gospel and agree with the Collect which is to be said with them.

It will be interesting in this connection to examine the Scripture Lessons proposed for this Sunday (in the Minor Services) in the varying tables of our three books. The Church Book in its lessons (usually so admirably chosen) errs here in making the *nerve* of the day to be an awakening from the dead (Deut. 32 : 39, 40, I kill, and I make alive; 1 Cor. 15 : 21-28, As by man came death; John 11 : 19-45, the Resurrection of Lazarus). Thomasius (in the General Synod's book) has 1 Kings 17 : 17-24, the raising of the Shunamite's son; Matt. 25 : 14-30, the parable of the Talents; and 1 Thess. 5 : 14-24, another great prayer of Paul for his converts. This is a much better parallel to the Epistle and Gospel. The United Synod's book has Matt. 13 : 43-52, the parables of the Pearl of Great Price and the Dragnet; Acts 17 : 15-30, Paul's Sermon at Athens; 2 Chron. 7 : 12-22, Solomon's Prayer that God would dwell in the Temple, a manifest reference to Paul's prayer that Christ may dwell in our hearts by faith; and Jer. 17 : 5-10, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and Blessed be the man that trusteth in the Lord. Without doubt this also has caught the note of the day.

This is an admirable example of what may be called the *churchly* arrangement and interpretation of Scripture—without absolute authority in any case, submitting itself freely to the spiritual judgment, and commending itself by the fulness with which it imparts the grace and wisdom of God. The mere use of these passages in relation to each other, is edifying.

III.

We have seen how the word of God is set forth, divided, interpreted and applied specially in the worship of the Church. But it is to be noted that the primary object of this service of worship is not the declaration of the word of God to unbelievers. We are considering *Christian Worship*, the characteristic, peculiar, historical worship of the Church of Christ. In this the word of God is not promulgated as a new and unfamiliar truth. It is not waited for with critical suspense of mind, or even with curiosity. The Church declares that which she knows well and rejoices in. She brings it forth from her treasures. She confesses it. She prays it. She gives thanks for it. She eats and drinks it. She lives by it. She finds in it the Life by which she lives, has lived and will continue to live. This brings us to the very characteristic of the worship of the Christian fellowship: *It is the joyous APPROPRIATION of the word of God in faith.*

We have adverted to the significance of the fact that the word of God is declared in our worship not as a record of the past, but by an assembly of confessors of the Name of Christ. They are assembled in His Name, and by virtue of His promise. They appeal to the faithfulness of His word. His word makes their act real, guaranteeing the presence of Christ with them. In their worship "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" they have fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, as well as with one another.

In an older time, when the sacerdotal theory prevailed, the Service was introduced by an act of confession and mutual absolution on the part of the clergy, who thus washed their hands in innocence, in order to approach God's altar. The essential truth of this confession is retained in our service, when the whole congregation of "priests unto God," about to offer Him a seasonable service, make confession of sin and appropriate His declaration of grace. Claiming a promise, they receive its gift, and go forward to the central mystery of worship cleansed by the Blood of Jesus Christ and clad in His righteousness.

As the Lord bade His disciples preach throughout the world the Forgiveness of Sins, the Absolution resounds in every part of the Service. It is the warrant of admission to it. It is the

outcome of the Atoning Sacrifice on which it is based. It is the door, the riven veil, through which we enter the Holy of Holies. If, for instance, in the *Kyrie* we put ourselves before God in inarticulate supplication, the *Gloria in Excelsis* is the song of the angels telling us anew that unto us is born a Saviour. The whole service is interwoven of such supplication and such answer giving us far more than we can ask or think.

It is the peculiarity of the Collect that it bases a prayer on an Attribute of God or some particular word of His, and asks for the very thing it promises and bids us pray for. The prayer is prompted by the Word, is borne by the Word, and by the Word is answered. As the Lord's Prayer is at the same time our petition and God's answer to it, so are the Collects. In them we do most assuredly take to ourselves and use the Word of God.

So when the Scriptures are read, they are not only set about with reverent prayers and thanksgivings, but in answer we confess the truth they tell by our repetition of the Creed;—not a fragment of the blessed word is suffered to be lost, but we gather it up.

The General Prayer of the Congregation is based on the Lessons and Sermon, on the total gift of God's word at that particular service, just as the Collect is on the word it pleads. What has been said of the Collect, applies to it.

And when we come to the Holy Communion, not even those who profess to empty it of its meaning have been able to escape the conviction of its reality. There the followers of Jesus repeat to Him in prayer His own words of Institution, His own promise and gift, His own bidding that they should do this till He come, and in virtue of that word are assured of His presence, of the gift of His Body and His Blood, of His absolution of each. They come at His invitation, and plead this as the whole warrant of their act, and He sups with them and they sup with Christ.

From beginning to end the Service is real; a real communion of the body of Christ, and of each member of it in particular, with our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and this, not by virtue

of the proclamation of His Word, but through the *appropriation* of it in faith.

NOTE.—By correct liturgical tradition the words of Institution are said as a prayer to Christ. In virtue of this word we take the Elements and the minister distributes them, and we hold this word before Him in confident prayer for its fulfilment according to His command and promise. This command and promise are the token of our admission to the Holy Supper of our Lord.

1. The words of Institution are not found in the Clementine Liturgy.

2. The Formula of Concord (664, 5) requires that the words of Institution in the Holy Supper should be intelligibly and distinctly sung or said publicly before the assembled people, and not in any wise omitted.

* * "The command of Christ, This do, which embraces the whole action of the sacrament, must be presented whole and inviolate. To this pertains that, in a Christian assembly, bread and wine be taken, blessed, distributed, received, eaten, drunk, and that the death of the Lord be thereby shown forth; just as St. Paul puts before our eyes the whole action, 1 Cor. 10."

3. Chemnitz says (Ex. 362) "Therefore in our Lord's Supper the words of Institution are recited not only historically, but that it may be shown to the Church that Christ Himself through His word according to His own commandment and promise is present and by the power of His word extends to those who eat, His own Body and His own Blood. For it is He who distributes, though it be through the minister: He it is who says, This is my Body: He it is who through this word of His brings it to pass that the bread becomes Body and wine His Blood. In this way we are certified and believe that in the Supper of the Lord we partake not of common bread and a common cup, but of the Body and Blood of the Lord."

4. Let us examine the directions of the Lutheran Church Orders on this point. It is to be borne in mind that they were occasioned by the Roman use of singing the words in the Latin tongue, with face turned from the people, in an undertone as *secreta*, the notion being that thus said by the priest they effected the transmutation of the elements.

1523 *Form. Missae* directed that the words be so recited that they may be heard by those standing near. The *Strassburg Kirchenampt* involves the words with the preceding prayer and recites them as an address to God. They are succeeded by a confession of God's goodness to us in the Sacrament, in that it certifies that we are really His children so that "We may freely pray as Thine Only-begotten Son has taught us, saying, &c." The Bavarian *Agendbüchlein*, 1717, (Veit Dietrich) directs that the words be said *Towards the Altar*. *Erbach* and *Breub.* Before the Altar, turned to the people, loud and clear. *Hesse*, 1526, In the vulgar tongue. *Brunswick*, 1528, "We ought to read and sing in German and the Sacrament should be said so as to be heard."

Goslar, 1531, "Thereupon read Dr. Luther's Exhortation to the people, and the Lord's Prayer, and the words of the Supper." *Wittenberg*, 1533, The priest prays the Lord's Prayer for the whole congregation, and consecrates for the communicants with such song as follows: *Lord's Prayer*—Choir answers *Amen*. The Presbyter then takes the bread in his hands, *Our Lord—in remembrance of me*. Here he holds the Sacrament up as is yet customary with us. *After the same manner—in remembrance of me*. Here he elevates the cup, according to our usage. *Liegnitz*, 1534, Exhortation, Preface, in which shall be included the words of our Lord concerning the Supper. *Cassel*, 1539, "Therefore pray with me the Lord's Prayer, as Christ Jesus our Lord taught us to do. * * * Now hear with upright hearts and true faith the word of the Supper." *Saxon*, 1539, In German. *Ref. Col.*, 1543, *Amen* said after the words. *Prussia*, 1544, "Hereupon the priest turns to the altar and begins the Benediction or Consecration immediately in the words of Institution *in nota praeftationis*." Höfling says, (121) Pomeranian: The Priest sings the *verba coenae* as well as the preceding Lord's Prayer with his face turned to the altar. This holds of Nordheim, Herz. Heinrich, Mecklenburg, Wittenberg, Pomeran, Brunswick, Niedersächs., Oldenburg, Eisleben, Electoral Saxony, Coburg, Weimar, Hildburghausen, Nassau, 1576, Nördlingen." "*Andorf and Friedb.* have "Over the paten." *Augsburg Agendb'lein* with prefatory words treats it as a biblical lection. So *Frankfort, Friedberg, Strasbourg, Hannover, Schw. Halle*, 1771.

Austria, 1571 *Verba*, turned to the people, holding each element in turn.

5. Kliefoth, (v. 110) says, "The recitation of the words of Institution is, as we have seen, not a sermon or an announcement, but says that His word is held up before the Lord that He may do according to it. Rightly therefore the great majority of the Orders have arranged that the words of Institution like the Lord's Prayer shall be said towards the altar."

We have thus considered the Word of God in Christian Worship, What it is, How it is imparted, and How it is appropriated. The declaration of the Gospel and the thankful acceptance of it are the two elements of the real worship of God. The Roman Catholic Church has departed from this conception, and, having accepted and consecrated the errors which paganism brought into the Church, has turned her worship into the offering of a propitiatory sacrifice. She repeats the Old Testament. I cannot but think that most writers on the Anglican Service have erred in persistently overlooking the Protestant,

the Lutheran elements in it, which give it such worth, and in seeking a commentary upon it in mediæval and older writers instead of the teaching of the reformers, from whom its intelligible and consistent elements were derived. They seek to explain it as a sacrifice, and to do so invent theories of sacrifice, instead of recognizing in Christian Worship the Church's declaration and appropriation of the regenerative Word of God.

ARTICLE VI.

THE DAY OF PENTECOST. ACTS II.

BY PROFESSOR ELI HUBER, D. D.

Immediately before his ascension into heaven Jesus promised his disciples that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. By this baptism they would be endowed with power from on high, whereby they would become qualified to be his witnesses throughout all the world. Till thus equipped for their mission they were not to depart from Jerusalem.

The time of waiting is spent in prayer and in supplication. The day of Pentecost is nigh at hand and it is natural to suppose that they would conclude that the event for which they were looking, would occur in connection with that great feast. And in this they were not disappointed, for when that day had fully come, they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.

The place is the upper room in which they have been in the habit of assembling for religious services. The time is generally taken somewhat indefinitely as some part of the Pentecostal day. A writer in an early volume of the *Expositor*, however, argues quite plausibly in favor of a more definite hour. As it was only nine o'clock when the Apostle Peter was already speaking, and time enough had already elapsed to enable the multitude to gather together and to behold and discuss the wonderful occurrences, he infers that the expression employed means the very beginning of the day, or six o'clock in the morning,

immediately after the fifty days that intervene between the Passover and Pentecost were fulfilled. It is, of course, not a vital question, but it is pleasant to believe that the Holy Spirit came down upon the little company of disciples at the very opening of the day. But whilst time and place are circumstances that need to be noticed, still, the event that occurred then and there is the great thing that claims our attention. The advent of the Holy Ghost, and the taking up of his abode in the hearts of the disciples, this constitutes the true wonder of the day. Let it then be the subject for consideration in this article, and in discussing it, it will be found convenient to gather the material relating to it, under the following heads :

I. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the accompanying phenomena.

II. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the source from which it emanated.

III. The gift of the Spirit in respect to the condition necessary to its reception.

IV. The gift of the Spirit in respect to its effect upon the life of the Church.

I. Let us consider the gift of the Holy Ghost in respect to the accompanying phenomena. These are very properly regarded as signs in relation to the wonderful event in connection with which they occurred. They were given for the purpose of assuring the minds of the disciples that the baptism, for which they were praying and waiting, had indeed been bestowed. They had been instructed not to go out on their mission of testifying for Jesus, until they had received the necessary fitness through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. In order, therefore, that they may enter upon their arduous work with courage and bear their testimony with confidence, they must be made free from all uncertainty as to whether they have received the promised baptism, and have been equipped with the requisite power from on high. The signs bestowed were undoubtedly intended to serve this purpose, and we know from subsequent history that the end for which they were designed was accomplished. After this day, it was never a question with them whether or not they

had received the gift of the Holy Spirit which Jesus had promised.

These signs, however, were not given merely for the sake of the disciples, but also for the benefit of the vast multitude of people now assembled in Jerusalem. Their attention must be drawn to this important occurrence, their interest excited, and their minds constrained to inquire into the meaning of what they had seen and heard. That they had this desired effect is evident from the narrative.

The signs under consideration are three in number; a sound of a rushing mighty wind, cloven tongues as of fire, and the speaking in unknown languages.

The first addresses itself to the sense of hearing. It is a sound, suddenly occurring, proceeding from heaven, like the rushing noise of a powerful wind, filling the house in which they were gathered together, and reaching even beyond, to the vast multitude with which the holy city was filled at this time.

The second sign presents itself to the sense of sight. It has the appearance of tongues like as of fire, parting asunder, and alighting upon each of the disciples.

The third and last is a sign for the understanding rather, a speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. The plain meaning of this evidently is, that these persons were enabled to speak of the wonderful works of God in languages which they had not learned before. From the list of nationalities represented, the number of such languages must have been considerable—probably, as some think, six or eight distinct languages and various dialects in addition.

The meaning of these wonderful manifestations is differently understood by different parties witnessing them. The sound having been heard at some distance from the spot whence it proceeded, arrests the attention of the crowd, excites their curiosity and causes them to rush in haste to the place to see what it meant. The number thus congregating is large, comprising devout men from every nation under heaven. But as they reach the spot where they expected to find out the cause of the strange sound that had come to their ears, another and yet

greater wonder appears unto them, and throws them into complete mental confusion, "because that every man heard them speaking in his own language." The speakers, surely, are all Galileans, and yet "we hear every man in our own language wherein we were born." They are amazed—they are filled with wonder—but they do not know what to make of it—they can see no cause that accounts for the effect they behold. In their perplexity they go from one to another, saying, What meaneth this? They are at their wits end—completely confounded.

There are others present, however, who find no difficulty in explaining the mystery. It is a very easy case. The men are simply full of new wine. The persons who thus judge may be animated by a hostile spirit, may be superficial in thought, or frivolous in character, but, however this may be, one thing is certain, their explanation is a very unreasonable one, as St. Peter presently proceeds to point out.

At this juncture St. Peter standing up with the eleven lifts up his voice and asks all present to hearken to him as he gives his view of the meaning of the things that so perplex them. He at once and emphatically rejects the explanation that ascribes the wonders they behold to the influence of new wine. These men are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. It is only nine o'clock and before that time no Jew that has any respect for himself eats or drinks anything at all. Till the morning sacrifice has been offered, he abstains from both food and drink. It is not usual even for regular drunkards to be the worse for liquor by day; they that be drunken are drunken in the night, says St. Paul. The mere mention of the hour of the day is in the judgment of Peter sufficient to satisfy all present that the charge of drunkenness does not account for the mystery they are seeking to solve.

Having thus summarily refuted the charge that these men were under the influence of strong drink, he proceeds at some length to explain the cause of all that they have seen and heard that day, and by which they have been so utterly confounded. "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out

my spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams, and on my servants and on my hand-maidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." The passage thus quoted by Peter is found in Joel 1: 28-32 and is embraced in our chapter in 17-21. Whatever it was that Joel said would happen in these last days, that according to Peter has now come to pass, and these wonderful manifestations are a sign and a testimony thereof.

The prophecy speaks concerning the Spirit of God—that it is to be imparted in a hitherto unheard of measure; bestowed, not upon a special class only or on a limited number, but upon all flesh, without distinction of age, sex, or station in life. Those who receive him shall behold visions and dream dreams—the usual mediae through which God revealed his will to his prophets. Having thus come into possession of the thoughts and intentions of the Almighty, they were enabled to prophesy and thus reveal to others what they had learned from God.

This outpouring of the Spirit of God upon the hearts of men, is to be followed by the judgment of the Lord against the ungodly heathen world, yea, against every power that opposes itself to the purposes of Jehovah. This may mean, in the first instance, the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish nation, and then, later on, that of the Roman Empire, and, in its widest sense, the overthrow of one heathen people after another till every high thing that exalteth itself against the kingdom of Christ shall have been cast down.

The Church by the power of the Spirit and of prophetic vision perceives the meaning of the tokens in the heavens and the earth, and knows that the judgment is approaching; sounds the note of warning to the world, and itself flees from the impending ruin, for "whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Thus by the action of the Spirit of God within the hearts of men, by the prophetic testimony of the Church, and by the destruction of all hostile powers without, the sanctification and glorification of the heavenly kingdom shall be

brought about, and the salvation of mankind become an accomplished fact.

Now this very thing that was foretold by the prophet Joel hundreds of years before, has been fulfilled this day, in the events of Pentecost. Not in the sense that all that is embraced in the prediction has already come to pass, but in the sense that the Spirit has come down upon the Church and will continue with her and work in and through her, until all God's purposes of grace are accomplished.

II. *The gift of the Spirit in respect to the source from which it emanates.* Having now established a connection between these Pentecostal signs and the gift of the Holy Ghost, he next goes on to trace the gift itself to the risen, and exalted Saviour, Jesus Christ, "who has shed forth this which ye now see and hear." As the sound, and flame, and unknown tongue are signs and evidences that the Spirit has been given, so the fact that the Spirit has been given, in its turn, becomes a sign of the exaltation of Jesus to be both Lord and Christ. How he connects the man of Nazareth with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, will become manifest by a careful consideration of the passages extending from verse 22 to 36.

He begins with Jesus as an individual. That such a person did appear among the children of Israel a short time before no one will question.

Claiming to have been sent from God on a special mission to the earth, he is accredited by God himself. He is true and faithful—"my Son in whom I am well pleased. Hear ye him." His approval was made manifest by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, as they themselves well knew. That miracles were wrought was not a matter of debate between the speaker and his hearers. That these were testimonials to Christ from God—St. Peter asserts—and is thus in agreement with the utterance of Nicodemus—"We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do the miracles that thou doest except God be with him." This much then is settled, Jesus of Nazareth is a man approved and accredited.

ited of God. Over against this, however, stands the fact that Jesus was put to death. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." This was a great stumbling block to the whole Jewish nation, and the arguments implied therein had to be constantly met in the preaching of the Gospel. His being put to death involved the idea of condemnation by the religious teachers and rulers of the land, rejection by God himself and an inconsistency with prophecy which according to their understanding taught that the Messiah should not die at all, but abide forever. But whatever objections might be derived from the fact of his death, they are all refuted by the other fact of his resurrection. That God raised him from the dead was the triumphant answer to all adverse arguments that were ever based upon his crucifixion. Paul certainly was in accord with Peter as to the value of the fact of the resurrection of our Lord, in answering objections based upon the condemnation and death of Jesus; for in the synagogue at Thessalonica we find him, for three successive Sabbath days, reasoning with the Jews out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you, is the Christ.

The resurrection of Jesus being so important as an argument in the establishment of his claims against unbelievers, the apostle realizes the necessity of proving the resurrection itself beyond all doubt. That which is to be the corner-stone in the great temple of gospel truth must itself be most securely laid.

To prove the assertion he has made that God raised up Jesus whom they crucified, he claims that it was not possible that he should be holden of death, because David, who is himself a prophet, spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption. The portion of Scripture, from which the whole prediction is taken, is the sixteenth Psalm, verses 8-11, and is found in our chapter in verses 25-28.

In this passage David expresses himself as follows: "There-

fore did my heart rejoice and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Having quoted the Psalmist's language, the apostle gives his own interpretation thereof, and states definitely to whom this declaration, in its true and full sense, is applicable. *Not to David*, "for he is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Of him it cannot be said that he has arisen from the dead. This accords entirely with St. Paul's declaration on this same subject: "For David after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption; but he whom God raised again saw no corruption."

David, then, did not say this concerning himself, but concerning the Messiah. David is himself a prophet, and he knows that of the fruit of his own loins according to the flesh, God will raise up one to sit on his throne. Foreseeing this, therefore, he spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, neither did his flesh see corruption. This, then, settles the question as to the person whose resurrection is foretold by the 16th Psalm. It is not David but Christ.

But as the word "Christ" is now very commonly used in a personal as well as an official sense, we must guard against mistake in summing up what Peter has thus far established from the prophet David. He has not yet proved that the Christ, whose resurrection is spoken of, is identical with the man Jesus of Nazareth. He has only shown that the Messiah, foretold by prophecy, shall be raised from the dead. This one mark any man must have who proposes to lay claims to the Messiahship. Who the individual is, that possesses this characteristic, is not decided in the Psalm under consideration. But Peter himself supplies what is yet wanting to complete the argument in favor of Jesus—when he makes the bold, unequivocal assertion, "This Jesus has God raised up whereof we all are witnesses."

Elsewhere St. Paul affirms the same facts. "God raised him from the dead," and appeals for confirmation to the same persons, as he adds, "and he was seen many days of them which

came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people."

Let us stop for a moment and see just where we stand in this discussion. From David we gather that the Christ when he comes shall bear this mark—that he has been raised up from the dead and was not suffered to see corruption. From Peter, supported by the other apostles, we learn that the individual, called Jesus, has been so raised up. We know, moreover, that he is the only one who has come forth from the grave without afterward seeing corruption. We are constrained, therefore, to conclude that Jesus is the Messiah—the Christ. Thus then we find ourselves in possession of two most important facts concerning Jesus—his resurrection from the dead and his Messiahship—Jesus has arisen—Jesus is the Christ.

Having now established these two facts, he takes a step forward in the discussion of his subject and assures his hearers that this same man was also exalted by the right hand of God. It reads as though it were a summary of all that had thus far been proved, or a conclusion to which he had come in the course of the argument—"therefore being by the right hand of God exalted." But the fact is he has not brought us thus far as yet. He has indeed raised him up from the grave, but he has not yet lifted him up into the heavens. The explanation of the seeming inconsistency is found in the fact that the resurrection of Jesus, which he has proved, involves the exaltation of which he speaks. This exaltation embraces two things, the ascension into heaven, and the sitting on the right hand of God entrusted with all power and authority. This is evident from what is said in the 34th and 35th verses taken from the 110th Psalm. Some one, as is implied in the exaltation previously spoken of, has ascended into the heavens; but it is not David himself, but David's Lord, to whom it is further said," "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool;" or in the language of St. Paul, "he shall reign until he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power."

Another step in advance is thus again taken. Jesus has risen—ascended—and sits on the throne at the right hand of power;

His mediatorial reign has begun—and now he receives the promised gift of the Holy Ghost from the Father—and having received it himself, he gave it to his disciples as he had engaged to do. "He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Thus the apostle connects the wonderful events of Pentecost with the man Christ Jesus—now exalted to be the Saviour of the world and made Lord of heaven and earth. This certainly is in accord with what Jesus himself had said: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." For the fact that the Holy Spirit has come down upon the disciples, because of the influence and interposition of Jesus with his Father, we depend, primarily, upon the statement of the apostle here made, but his declaration finds easy and full confirmation in the many utterances of Scripture on the subject. The Old Testament prophets hundreds of years before the Christian era, foretold the advent of the Spirit. Jesus while on earth and especially toward the end of his life, again and again, comforts his disciples by the promise of the Holy Ghost. When he goes away to him that sent him, the Comforter shall come. Just before his ascension he fixes the time more nearly—not many days hence; wait for it in Jerusalem. Having spoken thus, he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight. With the eye they can see no further, but two men in white apparel suddenly appear and tell them that Jesus is taken up from them into heaven. Only ten days after, the wonderful manifestations of Pentecost take place. How could they avoid the conclusion, Jesus has done this, has sent his Spirit, and shed forth this which ye now see and hear. To Jesus, then, as cause and giver we must ascribe the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

Peter having now proved the resurrection and Messiahship of Jesus, and his exaltation to the throne of the heavenly kingdom, with unlimited authority and power, sums up in verse 36 all that he has thus far established concerning him and affirms with great emphasis, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ."

These two terms—or their equivalents in chap. 5 : 31, Prince and Saviour—stand for much and very important truth in respect to Jesus. Knowing what they denote, we know the work and place of the Son of God in the kingdom of heaven.

On this account they are deserving of the most careful consideration. And let it be borne in mind that the place and power represented by them are the appointment of God. Jesus has not lifted himself into the high position; nor has he been put there by any effort of man. God alone has made him Lord and Christ.

The term *Christ* indicates the office he fills. It is the Greek word corresponding to the Hebrew Messiah. Both mean anointed, with reference to the Old Testament mode of inducting priest or king into office. As applied to Jesus it means that he has been chosen to a position of great dignity and power, but it does not in itself designate what it is. From Scripture declarations, however, we learn that he has been anointed prophet, priest and king, to reveal God's will, atone for sin, and reign over his people. The purpose for which he has been thus appointed is to save the world from sin and bring the human race, now in a state of insubordination, into a state of obedience to the divine law. To the attainment of this end he must do two things—make atonement for sin by the sacrifice of himself and then so change the mind, heart and will of the sinner that he will honestly turn away from all evil and yield prompt, and hearty obedience to all that God may command. This is the grand benevolent purpose of the office to which he has been anointed.

The enterprise he has thus entered upon is vast beyond our ability fully to conceive. It covers ages as to time—embraces all nations and all individuals thereof. Has to deal with characters of every kind—with men ignorant, stupid, debased, obstinate, always resisting the Holy Ghost. He who has ever seriously tried to convert a single sinner and hold him in the way of obedience subsequently, may have some faint idea of what Jesus took in hand when he came to save the world—but eternity alone can fully reveal all that is implied therein.

God has, however, made him Lord as well as Christ. As the Messiah, his office is to take away the sin of the world. To this end he must have a corresponding measure of authority and power—and the term Lord indicates that he is entrusted with both. Whatever authority is needful to accomplish the purpose contemplated in his appointment as Saviour, is undoubtedly conferred upon him; and to the authority is added an adequate degree of power to make it effective against all opposition.

How much authority and how much power he has been entrusted with, may be best understood by a careful consideration of the various Scripture declarations on the subject.

In the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, the blessed Master himself, before commanding the twelve to make all the nations his disciples, justifies the requirement by the bold assertion, "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth." The new version has "authority" in place of "power," but the two ideas are included in the word employed in the original. The declaration made is unqualified and denotes absolute, unlimited authority and power. In 1 Peter 3 : 22, the author having referred to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, adds the following, "who is gone into heaven and is on the right hand of God; angels, and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." All these beings, whether belonging exclusively to the heavenly world, or embracing earthly inhabitants and governments likewise, are under the control of Jesus and at his disposal for whatever services he may require of them.

St. Paul in Ephesians 1 : 19-23 is especially strong and comprehensive. He speaks here of the working of God's mighty power which he wrought in Christ, "when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

The language here used is simply overwhelming. It seats Jesus at the right hand of God in the heavenly places—in a

position in the universe higher than all created dignities what ever their station or rank. In trying to afford some aid in the consideration of this most wonderful passage, we will avail ourselves of the words of an able and thoughtful commentator on this Epistle: "The highest position in creation is yet beneath Christ. Some of the beings that occupy those stations have specific and appropriate names, but not only above these, but above every conceivable office and being, Jesus is immeasurably exalted. There is no exception; he has no equal and no superior, not simply among those with whose titles we are acquainted, but in the wide universe there is no name so high as his, and among all its spheres, there is no renown that matches his. These principalities stand around and beneath the throne, but Jesus sits at its right hand." As to the different ranks of angels here spoken of, the same writer adds—"All that we know is that there is foundation for the main idea—that there is no dull and sating uniformity among the inhabitants of heaven—that order and freedom are not inconsistent with gradation of rank—that there are glory and a higher glory—power and a nobler power—rank and a loftier rank, to be witnessed in the mighty scale. As there are orbs of dazzling radiance amidst the paler and humbler stars of the sky, so there are bright and majestic chieftains among the hosts of God, nearer God in position, and liker God in majesty, possessing and reflecting more of the divine splendor, than their lustrous brethren around them. But above all Jesus is enthroned—the highest position in the universe is his. The Seraph who adores and beams nearest the eternal throne is only *next to him*, but *next by a vast interval*."

These several passages certainly do teach us that the very highest possible measure of power has been given into the hands of Jesus—that he is at liberty to use all the material and all the spiritual forces in the universe to enable him to carry out the great purpose for which he has been appointed. Whatever power we find in the elements of nature, whatever is possessed and represented by human governments; whatever is in the hands of angels that excel in strength, all are subject to him and can be employed by him as the interests of salvation may

demand. Could we but comprehend in any considerable part the tremendous agencies Christ is warranted and enabled to control, it would give us a far more exalted idea of the greatness of the salvation of the Gospel than we have ever had before. We would no longer be able to hold it in light esteem but glorying in it as did the Apostle Paul, we would with him exclaim, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

III. *The gift of the Spirit in respect to the conditions necessary to its reception.* Under the influence of the Divine Spirit the effect of Peter's discourse upon his hearers was powerful. When they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts—or pierced, to use the word employed elsewhere to denote the wound made in the side of Christ by the soldier's spear. They are in deep distress of mind. Their conscience smites them sorely. They realize the meaning of what they in their ignorance and unbelief have done. They have rendered themselves guilty before God in the condemnation and crucifixion of his own Son. Yea, they have committed the unheard of folly of rejecting the very one for whose advent they were waiting and praying—their own Redeemer and King—the hope and consolation of Israel. Like patients suffering under some fatal disease, they have slain the one physician that had power to heal them. They have thrown away their only chance for deliverance. They are in great perplexity of mind and in their despair they turn to Peter and the rest of the apostles and earnestly ask, Men, brethren what shall we do?

The answer to this question is prompt, clear, and full of hope; Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

The words "unto the remission of sins" point out an end which they must keep in view, strive after, and attain unto, in order that they may be saved. They have sinned and must be forgiven, they have offended God and must become reconciled. There is no alternative in the case—they must come into a

state of justification before God—they must have peace with him through our Lord Jesus Christ—and in order to this they must obtain the forgiveness of their sins.

We now have the end to be gained. The means thereunto are repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ. Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins. Repent, change your mind, your views, feelings and purposes in general, but especially in regard to Jesus. You looked upon him as a deceiver of the people, making claims that could not be substantiated. You declared him a blasphemer and judged him to be worthy of death, and having thus condemned him you delivered him into the hands of the Gentiles to be crucified and slain. In all this you were mistaken. In spite of his condemnation before your highest tribunal, it turns out after all that your verdict was false, and that he was what he claimed to be—a messenger from heaven—the King of Israel—the Redeemer of the world. Recognize and confess that you were wrong. Undo as far as possible the mistake that you made—by now admitting that his claims were righteous—and acknowledging and accepting him as your Lord and Saviour. All this you may confess and do by one single act—baptism in Christ's name. For whoever consents to receive Christian baptism says thereby, I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Saviour of the world; and I agree hereby to own and accept him as such. I also believe that he is Lord in heaven and on earth, and I do hereby solemnly pledge myself to do whatever he tells me and observe all things he has commanded me through his apostles.

To all who comply with these requirements—doing what is involved in repentance and baptism—he gives the assurance that they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. By repentance and the faith in Jesus, included in and expressed by baptism, they have obtained the forgiveness of sins and consequently are now in a state of reconciliation toward God. And being reconciled there is nothing to separate between them and their God—and no reason any longer exists for the withholding of any, even the best and greatest of God's blessings, the gift of the Holy Ghost. Not, that the repentance and the faith and

pledge of obedience involved in baptism, are an equivalent for the gift that is promised, but they constitute a state of mind in man which justifies God in taking up his abode in him by the presence of his Holy Spirit. There is a difference between the bestowment of the Spirit and any other gifts which God might desire to impart. The latter are of an external character and do not involve the close union and the intimate fellowship implied in giving himself by his Spirit. God can without impropriety, without any reflection upon his moral character, show any favor however great to any man however degraded—but he cannot give himself in the high sense involved in the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, to any man not reconciled to him by repentance and faith in Jesus Christ. This holds also between the gift of the Spirit as dwelling within us, and the gift of the same Spirit as a mere external influence.

To encourage them to believe so wonderful a promise, and to justify himself in making it, he reminds them of the fact that this very blessing is guaranteed to them in their own scriptures—"for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call." Let them but comply with the terms laid down by the apostle and the gift of the Spirit will be sure to follow—and to this compliance Peter urges them with all earnestness, for with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. These "other words" may mean that having delivered the one discourse with the foregoing facts and thoughts, he added another in which he still further testified and exhorted—or that there was but one discourse, and in that one many other things were said by way of testimony and persuasion that are not recorded in our chapter. But however this may be, it is evident in either view, that St. Peter was concerned not only that they should know what they must do to be saved, but that knowing, they should make practical use of their knowledge and take such immediate action as would result in salvation. To secure the desired action he does the two things here spoken of—testifies and exhorts; employing "testimony, argument, and solemn affirmation" on the one hand—"summon-

ing, commanding, and persuading" on the other. His first aim is to beget faith in Jesus as the Christ, and in order to do this he furnishes all needful testimony, no doubt at the same time noting and refuting any objections that might be presented. But he aims at faith not as an end, but as a means. He must establish conviction in order that he may induce action. But this done, he does not rest there, but brings all possible pressure to bear upon them to constrain them to take such steps as will result in their salvation. Peter calls into requisition, all his power of reason and all power of will, to rouse his hearers to the effort necessary to secure deliverance from sin and destruction. Nor were his arguments and appeals in vain; many received his word, believed in Jesus, were baptized in his name and obtained forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost. The number thus added to the disciples was about three thousand souls. These new converts no longer holding with that crooked generation that Jesus was not the Messiah, would naturally turn away from them as being no longer in sympathy with them, and having now one Lord, one faith and one baptism with the friends of Jesus, they would just as naturally join themselves to them. Such a course is always a result and an evidence of the repentance and faith here enjoined by St. Peter; and it is an unfavorable indication when a professed believer finds no satisfaction in the society of Christians but feels perfectly at home in the company of those who make light of the things of Christ.

IV. *The Gift of the Spirit in respect to its effect upon the life of the Church.*

The account of the events of the day of Pentecost ends with the 41st verse; but from the few brief statements made at the end of the chapter we are enabled to gather a right good idea of the course these new converts afterwards pursued, and thereby, of the effect of the presence and operation of the Spirit. "*They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers.*" They did not cease to attend the instruction of the apostles, after baptism, but gathered around them habitually and earnestly, just as the twelve had done around their Master that they might

have the benefit of his teaching. They wanted to know more of the Saviour whom they had just accepted and gladly availed themselves of every opportunity for further information as to what he had said and done during his ministry.

They continued in fellowship also as well as in the teaching of the apostles. That is, they maintained constant brotherly associations with one another. Being of one mind and of one heart they were drawn together into a brotherhood of the closest character. The love that thus bound them together expressed itself in the "breaking of bread and in prayers." "The breaking of bread" refers to their custom of holding common evening meals which were attended by all the disciples. Those who were blessed with abundance, furnished the provisions necessary for these social repasts, and the poor as well as the rich partook thereof. What was left after all had eaten was at the service of the needy and could be carried by them to their own homes. These meals ended, after the example of Jesus at the last Pass-over, in the Lord's Supper. Thus the *fellowship* here spoken of would indicate itself in these social meals—in the gifts distributed thereat—in the observance of the Lord's Supper and in social prayers.

The next statement shows the effect produced upon all the people—"Fear came upon every soul." A feeling of solemnity and veneration and awe lays hold of the whole community as well as of the Christians themselves. It was the natural product of a vivid sense of the divine presence in their midst. God had manifested himself wonderfully in all that had happened recently amongst them. The large number that had accepted Jesus as Messiah; their diligent attendance upon the means of grace; the spirit of love and benevolence; the occurrences in connection with the gift of the Holy Ghost; the miracles still performed by the apostles; had an unearthly impressiveness and begat the fear spoken of above. This state of mind in the community served as a protection to the infant Church and favored the work of the Spirit and the spread of the Gospel. "And all that believed were together and had all things common." There is a sense of oneness and of brotherliness that results from their common relation to Christ. A brother

with abundance of this world's goods cannot possibly shut his bowels of compassion against a brother that is in destitution. Besides, we are told that not one of them said that aught of the things he possessed was his own. It is easy to see that such brotherly affection, and such sense of stewardship in respect to property would lead them to do just what they did, use what they owned for the welfare of all—selling their possessions and goods and distributing to all as every man had need.

What has been said so far has been said of them, not as Jews, but as Christians or believers. But in verse 47 we have a more general statement, giving a sort of summary of all they did after their baptism. They continued daily with one accord in the temple, worshiping as they had done before and as all the other Jews did who did not yet acknowledge the Messiahship of Jesus. Along with those services which were common to the disciples with the Jews, they also continued to break bread in fixed and separate assemblies—eating together in places of their own and concluding their meals as before with the Eucharist. Attending thus to all their religious duties—they ate their meat with gladness and singleness of heart. Thus rejoicing in God and full of brotherly love, they were habitually in a state of mind that inclined them to praise the Lord and enabled them to find favor with the people.

Under circumstances such as are here described, it is not a matter of surprise that the membership of the Church should grow constantly and regularly. *"And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved."* The hand of the Lord is in the accessions. It is he that gives the increase. The persons thus added are described as the saved or those in process of salvation. Such are added to the other believers. This indicates the judgment of Jesus as to what to do with men who are in the way of salvation—bring them into the fellowship of the saints—add them to the Church of Christ.

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Christian Worship. Ten Lectures delivered in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. pp. 338. \$1.50.

This work is a sign of the times and a book for the times. The non-liturgical churches of America are confronted by a sudden revolution in the conduct of public worship and how to meet this revolution is the question of the hour. The wide-awake authorities of Union Seminary conceived a happy idea when, through one of their generous Directors, they provided last Autumn for a Course of Lectures on this subject in that Institution, from ten representatives of seven religious denominations. And now the Christian public is favored with these Lectures in a printed form, a volume which will be found to be as timely as it is instructive and interesting.

That representatives of the Episcopal, Lutheran, Reformed Presbyterian, Baptist and Congregational bodies, should present as they do here a substantial unity of sentiment on the conduct of public worship is itself a most impressive and suggestive phenomenon, especially when one recalls how this very subject was a prominent factor in the historic separation of some of these bodies from each other. No wonder that the general revival of interest in the ordering of worship, aided as it is by the tendency to uniformity, is viewed by many of these Lecturers as a movement destined to powerfully promote the cause of church unity. They see that "amidst the doctrinal divisions and governmental conflicts of eighteen centuries, and beneath the almost infinite variations of ritual, there has been maintained, throughout the Christian society, presumably by the intervention and care of the Holy Spirit, a practically universal adherence to those elements of worship which form the apostolic and fundamental contents of the institution." "It would be the ideal of worship," says Dr. Hastings, "if all Christians of all denominations could be outwardly one at least in song and prayer. Thus on the one hand might be avoided the danger which freedom in public worship involves, and on the other hand the danger which fixedness in public worship involves. The ideal must be the combination or the interblending of the two methods, the liturgical and the non-liturgical. * * * Then and thus the real oneness of all believers would be proclaimed and emphasized; then and thus the churches which differ in polity or in doctrine would be visibly one before the throne of grace."

Invaluable as are the contributions to this volume from those repre-

senting liturgical churches—and the Lecture by Dr. Jacobs on the Lutheran Liturgies is exceptionally so—the chief interest to the reviewer is found in the utterances of the Congregational, Presbyterian and Baptist representatives. The keynote with all of these is the priesthood of believers, sustained by the unassailable logic, that the part taken by worshipers must be coextensive with this priesthood. "Worship is a primary function, * * worship distinctively regarded as service collectively rendered unto God; common prayer, common praise, common liturgical and sacramental usage."

Among these same representatives there is a general lament over the neglect which this primary and momentous subject has received. "Liturgics," says Prof. Smyth, "is at present the least developed department of theological science." What a confession! And what a commentary on the harvest reaped from opposition to fixed forms!

With this confession is very properly united a striking modesty as to the best methods for meeting the demands for "a richer, more expressive, more uplifting Christian worship throughout the Church." No one has the assurance to propose the preparation of new forms. "The important thing is," says Dr. Hastings, "not to add to divisiveness and confusion by *making new* forms. It may not be best that these forms should be taken from the Book of Common Prayer, though this would be my preference; it may be better that they should be compiled from that and also from other existing liturgies." We suggest to the learned Doctor that he emphasize the last clause. The Lutherans are ahead this time, and there are found forms in their Service which, we know, commend themselves unqualifiedly to Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Methodists.

All unite in accentuating the value of the most ancient forms, recognizing that it is through these "that the faith of Christ has been conserved upon the earth, rather than through the involved confessional creations that lie dormant in theological literature. * * The Apostles' Creed, the *Gloria Patri*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the *Te Deum*, the Nicene Creed, the Words of Institution at the Lord's Supper, have kept the Catholic faith unspotted from the world, unwarped by the Church." Maintaining the principle of freedom in the use of any form, Prof. Smyth justly observes, "It is a poor freedom that cannot use the best." And the best, according to a quotation from Dr. Hitchcock, are the most ancient. "The farther we get down the centuries, the more precious will be to us the long unbroken melodies of praise and prayer." "To the reflective worshiper," says Geo. Dana Boardman, "few things are more inspiring than the sense of joining in strains centuries old."

The endeavor to contribute to the construction of a proper liturgy, on the part of divines to whom this is, in practice at least, a comparatively new field, is a very entertaining study. Sometimes the true scien-

tific mark is hit, sometimes it is missed. Two Presbyterians agree in giving seven elements of worship and their order of sequence.

Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall sets forth very clearly the true relation of the Creed to the Scriptures: "The word of man should be the echo of the word of God. The heart of man should reply to the outpourings of the heart of God." But both mistake the proper position of the Prayer, placing it before the Teaching, or the Sermon, although they are reminded by another Presbyterian (p. 265) that the long prayer before sermon is "contrary to all the practice of the Church, old or late." Besides, their own views as to the relation of teaching or preaching to worship point conclusively to the Prayer and Oblation as following the Sermon. "Worship," says Dr. Hall, "is ever regarded in the New Testament as an effect of knowledge." "Worship is the expression of faith, but the substance of faith must forever be recruited by growth of knowledge." Dr. Hastings repeats this judgment. "The true object of a Sermon is to feed the fires of devotion, of consecration, and of service." "Instruction feeds the flame of worship, and through it comes that necessary increment of knowledge which is fuel for the altar fire of worship." "The divine giving is, in the Christian scheme of worship, the inspiration of the human giving."

This being so, then surely the proper place for the Prayer and the Oblation is after the Sermon. The very same arguments which fix the Creed, the expression of our faith, after the reading of the Scriptures, fix likewise the offerings of prayer and alms after the flames of devotion have been kindled through instruction from the divine word. The Creed of the congregation is the response to the word read, the alms and prayers of the congregation form the response to the word preached.

Lutherans who may have faint recollections of controversial utterances on worship, will find a point of supreme interest in positions assumed by Presbyterian divines on the relation of the Sermon to the other parts of the service. Luther's dictum: "The greatest and most important part of all the worship of God is the preaching and the teaching of God's word," is condemned as "an extreme." And over against this is quoted the Presbyterian *Directory for Worship*, maintaining it "as one primary design of public ordinances to pay social acts of homage to the most high God," and directing ministers "not to make their sermons so long as to interfere with or exclude the more important duties of prayer and praise." "The Sermon," adds Dr. Hastings, "must not be permitted to subordinate praise and prayer, or the reading of the Word."

On the relative importance of the Sacraments the same divine makes them "constitute the crowning element of worship." He objects to the celebration of the Holy Communion at the close of an ordinary service, "unless it can be made the culmination and not the mere hurried

conclusion of such a service." And Dr. Egbert Smyth, whose rank as a historian is beyond question, declares, "This celebration was from the beginning, doubtless, the centre and culmination of the Christian worship."

The critic is trespassing, he realizes it, but a volume so rich in attractions and so full of surprises it is very hard to lay down. For the readers of the *QUARTERLY*, most of whom have a profound interest in liturgical studies, we volunteer without hesitation, but not without deliberation, the advice, by all means make this inexpensive work your own and loan it to your friends.

E. J. W.

The Claims of the Old Testament. By Stanley Leathes, D. D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in King's College, London. pp. 73. \$1.00.

Two Lectures on Theism. By Andrew Seth, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. pp. 64. \$1.00.

The Descent of the Primates. By A. A. W. Hubrecht, Professor of Zoology in the University of Utrecht. With Illustrations. pp. 41. \$1.00.

These are some of the notable lectures delivered at Princeton University during the celebration of the sesquicentennial of that institution. In the whole series there are seven volumes, the other four being Professor Dowden's "French Revolution and English Literature;" Professor Thomson's four lectures on "The Discharge of Electricity in Gases;" Professor Klein on "The Mathematical Theory of the Top;" and Professor Brugmann on "The Nature and Origin of the Noun Genders in the Indogermanic Languages." They constitute a learned and scholarly series well worthy of being published and widely read.

The Builders and Other Poems. By Henry Van Dyke. \$1.50.

This beautiful little volume is worthy of the author and the publisher. Dr. Van Dyke showed himself a sympathetic student of poetry in his exposition of Tennyson. He has here showed himself a versifier of no mean merit. From time to time pieces of verse have appeared over his name which revealed a poet's appreciation of nature and a poet's insight into the depths of the soul. They were the harbingers of the little volume before us, which, slender as it is, shows what we may expect from Dr. Van Dyke in the future. Dr. Van Dyke is a poet—not a great poet, but a true one. He can write a song of nature that breathes the air of outdoor life, of which he is so fond. Any one of the "Songs out of Doors" would establish this, particularly "An Angler's Wish." He catches the bird-notes with a poet's ear. The Academic Ode which gives its title to the volume is an occasional poem, which, while inspired of a fine thought, like most poems of the sort loses much apart from the event it celebrated. The mechanical

work of the book is a triumph of the printer's art and reflects great credit upon the Scribner publishing house.

H. C. A.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.

Life After Death and the Future of the Kingdom of God. By Bishop Lars Nielsen Dahle. Translated from the Norse by the Rev. John Beveridge, M. A., B. D. pp. x., 455. \$3.50.

To certain departments of literature, in recent years, Norwegian authors have contributed works that have received almost as much attention by the English reading public as at home. *Life after Death* introduces a Norwegian theological writer. It is the first of its class translated into English.

Bishop Dahle is Superintendent of the Missionary Work of the Norwegian Church, having been, since 1877, Bishop of the Norwegian church of Madagascar. He bears the title of the Order of St. Olaf for his distinguished services and investigations. The volume is a discussion of the Biblical doctrine of the last things, both as concerns the individual and the Church. It is a close study of the word; and where the word is silent, the distinction is marked between what is revealed and what is human speculation. In this respect Bishop Dahle's study is very candid and clear. Particularly is this true of the chapters, "The Kingdom of Death and the Intermediate State" and "The End." The author's teaching is bold and individual, but deeply Scriptural. He argues his points with scholarly patience and exhaustiveness. The book is a study of "last things." The style is popular and simple and the book will prove interesting reading in the hands of any reader.

H. C. A.

The Hope of Israel: A Review of the Argument from Prophecy. By F. H. Woods, B. D. pp. viii., 212. \$1.40.

This volume is a collection of twelve lectures delivered by the author, on the Warburton foundation, in Lincolnshire Chapel in 1890-94. The lectures are on the fulfillment of prophecy and follow the lines established by modern exegesis, which find much more of fulfillment in the author's own times and less in the future. The study of Messianic prophecy is fine and suggests Riehm. The lectures are given a practical turn, and altogether are a positive contribution to the literature of the subject.

H. C. A.

The Spirit of Power as set forth in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. Thomas Adamson. pp. 85. 50 cts.

This little work sets forth very cleverly according to the inspired text the state of the men who had the Spirit of Power in the Primitive Church, and it shows how that state was brought about. The author's method is exegetical rather than dogmatic. When he attempts the lat-

ter we cannot follow him. We do not believe that "the Jerusalem Church was baptized the second time," although we can accept the statement that "there was a new influx of power." It might be less misleading, however, to speak of a new manifestation of the power which was received once for all.

E. J. W.

Foundation Truths of Scripture as to Sin and Salvation in Twelve Lessons. By John Laidlaw, D. D. pp. 131. 45 cts.

Not for a long while has a publication appeared containing in so brief a compass so large a measure of sound evangelical teaching. It is a clear, striking exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism, and it adds very much to the reputation already won by "the Handbooks for Bible Classes" to which series it belongs.

The relation in which Prof. Laidlaw places regeneration to faith will have special interest to Lutherans. He makes regeneration "the absolutely initial grace, the very first step in personal salvation," and he holds that "the person who is just being changed is, at the time of the change, passive, if not even unconscious of it." Of faith he says: It is "the act not of a dead, but of a living soul, therefore the act of faith has been produced by the quickening grace of God's Holy Spirit." "The chain of initial or preparatory grace is complete when Faith crowns the series."

The value of the Sacraments is of course not emphasized as it is in the Lutheran Church, yet they are recognized as the symbol and seal of our union with Christ. Of the Holy Supper it is said: "No amount of abuse of this ordinance through externalism or superstition should make us forget its real place and power or fail in its gracious use or privilege."

E. J. W.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON.

Visions and Service: Fourteen Discourses delivered in College Chapels. By William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts. 12mo. pp. viii., 235. \$1.25.

Bishop William Lawrence is the successor of Phillips Brooks as Bishop of Massachusetts. For ten years he was dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, and at the same time preacher to Harvard University. This volume is a collection of discourses, most of them delivered to the students in St. John's Memorial Chapel, some of them to the University students in Appleton Chapel. The discourses are clear and appealing—admirably adapted to the class of hearers to whom they were addressed. College and university students as a rule do not go to church for conventional reasons: they are indifferent to many of the methods of the pulpit; but they are won at once by ringing conviction, clear thought and genuine literary form. These elements characterize this volume of sermons, and we are not surprised to learn that Bishop Lawrence was ever popular with Harvard students.

The practical side of theology is always enforced, duty is made paramount, and "Visions and Service" blended in strong outline. It is a noble little volume.

H. C. A.

Memories of Hawthorne. By Rose Hawthorne Lathrop.

All admirers of Hawthorne will be prepared for delightful entertainment in this volume, but it is by no means they alone who will find interest in it. The story of two such lives as those of Mr. and Mrs. Hawthorne, filled as they were with all that was ennobling and beautiful cannot fail to attract many readers for its own sake. Much of the story is told by the many letters of Mrs. Hawthorne which are given. These letters are full of interest and as her daughter says "profound in thought and loveliness." They begin with her girlhood and run on into her married life, which was the most ideal of any of which we have read. As might be supposed the friends of these cultured persons were among the most desirable of their period, and here the reader seems to be drawn into the very heart and life of the intellectual spirits of that time. And glimpses are obtained of them in their private life that are very pleasant. Mrs. Lathrop has added to these delightfully welcome reminiscences the charm of a graceful style, and as she writes of her father's literary successes and her mother's work in art, as she tells of their home life, than which none could have been more beautiful, and as she recounts their friendships with the great and good of their time, she completely fascinates her readers. It is in every detail a delightful book.

The Day of His Youth. By Alice Brown.

There is about this story a touch that is in every way artistic. It is the history of lives lived in a great degree apart from the world, with nature for a close and well-understood companion. The father of the hero, sickened with the sorrows of life and with the "wrongs which he could not right" betakes himself with his son to a lonely island and there becomes his sole companion and instructor, but a change in the situation occurs, and the further interesting developments the reader must find out for himself. One sentence particularly impressed us. It was in the advice which the father gave his son when he said: "And if you can, do something, too, for art—but after all, I shall be content if you keep your soul clean." We find many bright happy thoughts finely expressed and none more so than in the comparison of America with older nations. It is a unique story and one that will win many admirers. It is another book which will add much pleasure to the vacation days.

Upon the Tree-Tops. By Olive Thorne Miller.

Some one in writing of Helen Keller has said that in thinking of her she blushed to think how little she saw, how little she heard. It is

with a similar feeling that we read Mrs. Miller's new book. Her wonderful acquaintance with birds and nature in general is very powerful in convincing the general reader of his ignorance in that direction. It has been her pleasure intelligently to study the life and habits of her "little neighbors in feathers" and she has come very close to them, and has discovered for her own pleasure and the profit of her readers where certain birds are to be found, what their songs are, how they build their homes, on what they feed and, indeed, what their habits in general are. For some time Mrs. Miller had a bird-room in which to closely observe the creatures in which she has found so much of interest and the result of these observations which she here gives are very interesting, but we have been particularly pleased with the result of her tramps through woods and meadows and over hills and in deep valleys for she finds more than the birds in these walks: she has a keen appreciation for everything in nature, and whether she describes the sky or the country by-road, the various trees with which she is uncommonly familiar, or a neighboring cornfield, it is all filled with the charm of an intelligent lover of nature. We have found this book particularly pleasant and profitable and consider it especially adapted for the vacation tour, as it is likely to lead its readers into acquaintance with many songsters hitherto unknown and unnoticed.

Mere Literature. By Woodrow Wilson. pp. 247.

Eight essays, all but one of which have before appeared in leading magazines, are brought together in this volume. Their subjects are, *Mere Literature*; *The Author Himself*; *On an Author's Choice of Company*; *A Literary Politician*; *The Interpreter of English Liberty*; *The Truth of the Matter*; *A Calendar of Great Americans*; and *The Course of American History*. The style of this writer is excellent, his English pure and elevated, and he discovers and reveals new beauties in literature. If there is one thing that he succeeds in doing more than another it is in creating a taste for what is best in literature and a determination to find in the works of the best writers of the Ages their deepest, most hidden meanings. We cannot imagine any reader following the study of Mr. Wilson's book with any of the literary trash that is being so rapidly put upon the market. His own contempt for inferior literary work he imparts to his reader, and his ability to analyze a writer's merits he so forcibly impresses upon him, that he regards with envy the author's keen appreciation of literary work. If such books are read and studied more we may look to our near future for a different class of books.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

The Bible as Literature. By Prof. Richard G. Moulton, Ph. D., the Rev. John P. Peters, Ph. D., the Rev. A. B. Bruce, D. D. and others.

With an introduction by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D. One vol. 12mo, pp. 375. Cloth \$1.50.

CONTENTS.—Introduction; Chapter I., The Bible as Literature; Chapter II., Literary Aspects of Genesis; Chapter III., The Law of Moses; Chapter IV., The Age of the Judges; Chapter V., Ruth and Esther Chapter VI., The Book of Job as Literature; Chapter VII., The Poetry of the Psalms; Chapter VIII., The Wisdom Literature; Chapter IX., The Love-song of the Bible; Chapter X., A Study of Isaiah; Chapter XI., Jeremiah the Prophet; Chapter XII., Ezekiel and His Times; Chapter XIII., Amos at Bethel; Chapter XIV., The Book of Jonah; Chapter XV., The Parables; Chapter XVI., Luke as an Historian; Chapter XVII., The Fourth Gospel; Chapter XVIII., The Epistles of Paul as Literature; Chapter XIX., The Epistles to the Hebrews; Chapter XX., The Apocalypse of John; Chapter XXI., The Influence of Biblical upon Modern English Literature.

The literary study of the Bible has come to be the fashion among intellectual people. No line of reading has grown more popular. As a consequence the literature on the subject has multiplied. This volume takes its rank at once as probably the best hand-book on the subject accessible. There is an unusual array of talent: *e. g.*, Dr. Moulton on the general subject; Prof. Bruce on Moses; Prof. Genung on Job; Dr. Van Dyke on the Psalms; Prof. Beecher on The Wisdom Literature; Prof. Vincent on The Parables; Prof. Stevens on St. Paul, *et al.* It is to be remembered that literary students of the Bible are not pursuing doctrinal study. Biblical Theology is another matter. The literary student seeks to understand the literary form and purpose of a book and to give it its right setting. In recommending this volume as a popular hand-book we do not endorse all the views of individual writers.

H. C. A.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Die rechte Unterscheidung von Gesetz und Evangelium. 39 Abendvorträge von Dr. C. F. W. Walther. Aus seinem Nachlass. 8vo. pp. 401.

When asked lately for translations of Dr. Walther's works, the writer of this responded, that the reading of Dr. Walther's works would repay every Lutheran minister for the mastery of the German language. In this conviction he feels very much strengthened by the present volume, which in a series of Lectures discusses the momentous distinction between the law and the gospel. A more instructive and a sounder treatise on this extremely practical subject is nowhere to be found. Dr. Walther absorbed, as probably no one had ever done before, and Luther brought out the teaching of Paul on this point as no teacher before him had done.

Luther's polemic against the antinomians of his day is clearly set forth, and his defense against their charge of inconsistency is exceedingly instructive.

Walther's analysis of Pietist theology and of its attempt to find in the Sermon on the Mount the successive stages of the order of salvation, shows the unsoundness of Pietistic interpretation of the Scriptures, notwithstanding its spiritual bloom while it adhered to orthodox teaching.

One of the most striking passages of this volume that has met our eye is the attack on the Separatists of Prussia, who in their recoil from "the Rationalism and Indifferentism of the State Church fell into Particularism and anti-Lutheran Hierarchism." Their claim that "the true visible Lutheran Church is the Church of the third article of the Creed, *the Church in the highest and proper sense of the word, the ecclesia extra quam nulla salus*," is declared to be a deplorable and momentous error, directly opposed to the dear word of God, and subversive of the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, the justification of a poor sinner before God only for Christ's sake through faith.

If our Lutheran Pastors generally could have the help of such a sterling volume, we are confident that their sermons would be vastly enriched with evangelical truth and that their hearers would profit proportionately in their edification. The very aim of these evening lectures to his students was, in the words of their author, "to speak the doctrines of Holy Scripture into their hearts." There was no cold or dead orthodoxy in Dr. Walther.

Now that we have this Second Series of the Lectures on *Gesetz und Evangelium* we very much regret that the first series, which made a small volume in boards, was not reserved to be bound along with the second series in one volume. Outwardly the two volumes have nothing in common, while in their contents the present volume is simply an expansion and completion of the other.

E. J. W.

OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO., CHICAGO.

Martin Luther. By Gustav Freytag. Translated by Henry E. O. Heinemann. pp. 130. \$1.00.

We make two quotations from the early pages of this book which will show the spirit in which it was written—that the author, while he finds some things to censure, is after all a great admirer of Luther and is constrained, time and again, to express his admiration. On page 2 he says: "Some of those things, which in his stubborn fights Luther defended against both Reformed and Catholics, have been condemned by the freer intelligence of the present age. His doctrine, wrung from a passionate, high-strung, reverential soul in convulsive struggles, failed, in some not unimportant particulars, to hit the right point; at times he was harsh, unjust, even cruel towards his adversaries; but such things should no longer perplex us, for all the limitations of his nature and culture are overwhelmed by the wealth of bliss which flowed from his great heart into the life of mankind." And again, on page 4, this: "Many things about him appear strange and uncouth,

when viewed at a distance, but his picture has the remarkable quality of becoming bigger and more lovable the closer it is approached."

The book is not a biography in the sense of giving the events of his life in detail, but aims rather to let us know "how he grew and what he was." This it does in a charming way. It is only here and there at long intervals that a blemish is found, and the picture that is presented is, upon the whole, one that presents the great reformer in a most satisfactory way. We are sorry to see, however, (p. 84) that the old exaggeration is repeated of making Luther call the Epistle of James an "epistle of straw" instead of comparatively a right strawy epistle—"eine rechte stroherne Epistel." But the author has many companions in this offense and it will take many a correction yet before the expression is changed. The book is well printed and illustrated.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Annotations on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and the Hebrews. By Edmund J. Wolf, D. D. On *Philemon*. By Edward T. Horn, D. D. pp. 519.

Annotations on the General Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. By Revere F. Weidner, D. D., LL. D. pp. 380.

What Dr. Wolf says respecting the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles in answer to the objections as to their Pauline authorship is well put and altogether reasonable. The authorship of Hebrews he sensibly leaves an open question and wastes no words upon it. In his annotations on the various epistles he gives ample evidence of the masterful exegete. His discriminating use of the tenses and cases, and his appreciation of the full etymological force of Greek words and their synonyms make his comments unusually lucid. One of the places where this is quite well shown is in his annotations on Heb. 2: 1-4, pages 264-268. As a model of clear and suggestive expository work we cite pages 53-58 on 1 Timothy 3: 14-16. There are suggestions here for more than one sermon.

This belongs to a series that goes under the title of "Lutheran Commentary," but the marks of denominationalism are not much in evidence—certainly not obtrusively so. Indeed, if the title were not what it is, the denomination of the author could scarcely be detected from these comments.

The introduction and annotations on the epistle to Philemon by Dr. Horn are most excellent. They give a point and value to that epistle that will greatly enhance it in the estimation of every Bible student.

Dr. Weidner, in the General Epistles assigned to him, has given an example of clear and practical exposition of Scripture. The introductions to the several books are excellent, as also are the *excursus*. Of the latter two follow the Epistle of James—one on "The Helvidian

Theory" that the "brethren of our Lord" are the sons of Joseph and Mary, and the other on "Luther on the Epistle of James." Five follow the "First Epistle General of Peter," all of them of much interest. They are on "Peter as the Rock," "The Descent of the Soul of Christ into Hades at the Time of his death," "The Descent of Christ, the Risen God-Man, into Hades," "The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Purgatory," "The Doctrine of the Universal Restoration of the Wicked." To the General Epistle of Jude there is an *excursus* on "The Assumption of Moses." Dr. Weidner unhesitatingly favors the view that there were two descents into Hades. He says (p. 144): "Note distinctly that the passage in Acts 2: 24-31 refers to the *Descent of the Soul of Christ* into Hades *before* his resurrection, and that this Descent is the last act in his state of humiliation, and must sharply be distinguished from his second Descent into Hades as the Risen God-Man, which is the first act of the state of *Exaltation*." This is the view he supports in *Excursus II*.

These two volumes are valuable additions to those of this series already issued by the Christian Literature Company.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

History of the Christian Church. By John Fletcher Hurst. Vol. I. pp. 949. \$5.00.

In issuing the "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature" the publishers are doing a most serviceable work for theological students. Those that have already appeared are, Harman's "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," Terry's "Biblical Hermeneutics," Bennett's "Christian Archaeology," Miley's "Systematic Theology" (in two volumes), Crooks and Hurst's "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology," and the first volume of Hurst's "History of the Christian Church." They have been prepared by Methodist authors, printed by a Methodist publishing house, pledged to be in harmony, in doctrinal spirit, with the accepted standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but with the aim "to make the entire Library acceptable to Christians of all evangelical Churches." The denominational bias is distinctly manifest—fully enough to show that the authors have not been unmindful of the "pledge," and yet not to such an extreme that the "aim" to make their works acceptable to others than Methodists, is lost sight of. The whole set of books will make a desirable addition to any library.

This first volume of Bishop Hurst's Church History takes us to the German Reformation, thus covering about fifteen centuries. This period is divided into two parts—the history of the Ancient Church, A. D., 1-680 and the history of the Church of the Middle Ages, A. D., 768-1517. The Ancient Church is divided into (1) The Apostolic Age, A. D. 1-100; (2) The Patristic Age, 101-313; (3) The Controversial Age, 313-680. To give all this in one volume the treatment is necessarily incomplete. This, no doubt, was felt by the author even more

than it is by the reader. The second volume will begin with the time of Luther and bring the history to the present time. This will likely appear some time in 1898. Limited as the work will be to two volumes, though of good size, it will not supplant the standard histories by Neander, Gieseler, Kurtz or Mosheim, though it will have the merit of being less antiquated. Nor will it take the place of Schaff in the case of those who have ample time to give to the rich field of Church History; but to the theological student and the busy pastor this history will be most acceptable. Its fresh and pleasing style greatly enhances its attractions and gives much pleasure to the reader.

In a few places there is an intensity of portrayal that we regard as hardly supported by the facts of history, or at least as given with less guarded discrimination than should appear in a calm historical work. For example, take the picture given here of the Roman training of children, pp. 72-75. We doubt whether there can be found in any nation a more careful training of childhood in the duty of obedience to parents in love of their country and respect for its laws, and in reverence for their gods (such as they were), than among the old Romans. This, indeed, is what made Rome so strong. The Roman "pedagogue" was not the child's school-teacher, as we are told here, and the fact that his teacher was a slave is very little in derogation of his school-training when we bear in mind that many of the Roman slaves were cultured Greeks. But where there is so much to commend in Dr. Hurst's history we would not magnify a fault found here and there on its interesting pages.

We take a special pleasure in calling attention to the valuable bibliography of this work. The author himself excels as a bibliographer, and he had most competent assistants in Dr. Faulkner and Rev. C. R. Gillett. The reader who has the bibliography of the first fourteen pages on general Church History and that which precedes each topic throughout the work, will find little else to be desired in this line. The discriminating estimates of the value of the various works are highly serviceable.

Champions of Christianity. By Silas Farmer. pp. 139. 60 cents.

This little book contains the testimony in favor of Christianity given by leading men of various nationalities and vocations. They are divided into five main classes and each one of these further divided into as many or more sub-classes. Thus we have statesmen, jurists, generals, philanthropists, physicians, lawyers, merchants, explorers, painters, architects, editors, philologists, poets, historians, astronomers, physicists, geologists, chemists, botanists, all reverently testifying to the truth and power of Christianity. It is a useful collation, and will prove helpful to faith as well as furnish examples to show that the brightest and best sons of earth have been champions of the religion of the lowly Nazarene rather than antagonists, as is so often confidently averred.

FLOOD AND VINCENT, MEADVILLE, PA.

Roman and Medieval Art. By W. H. Goodyear, M. A. pp. 250.

The interest in the old Roman world never wanes. Its surpassing success in organization, government and laws continues to win increasing admiration from the student of history. Its attainments in literature and art, however, were not so marked, and yet the student of language and art finds much to fascinate him and win him to investigation and study. Debtors as ancient Rome was to Greece and the Orient for her art, modern nations are equally indebted to Rome for theirs. Especially is this true when we use the word "art" as covering monuments and buildings as well as the paintings and sculpture that carry with them the suggestion of luxury rather than of what is practical.

The medieval period is often called the "Dark Ages" and few are disposed to spend much time on its history and art. And yet, when once we begin to lift the veil, we find enough to interest and even fascinate us. In a special degree is this true of the art of the latter part of the Middle Ages, and preëminently in Gothic architecture. The cathedrals in this style have long been the admiration of the world.

This book does a good service in telling us about "Roman and Medieval Art." The illustrations, of which there are one hundred and fifty-nine, are excellent and add a charm to the plain and otherwise unadorned text. The good quality of the paper and printing helps to make attractive a very valuable and pleasing book.

Notices of *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ* by Schwartzkopff, of Vol. II., of the *Hebrew People*, by Kent, and of the "New Greek Concordance" are unavoidably delayed. All are publications from the House of Charles Scribner's Sons.

PERIODICALS.

The Atlantic Monthly for July contains a list of articles that will prove very tempting to all lovers of choice literature. It is only to these that the *Atlantic* caters and for them it monthly spreads such a feast as gives the highest pleasure, the surest profit. In this number are discussed in the best possible manner, The Making of the Nation; John Sterling and a Correspondence Between Sterling and Emerson; The Decline of Legislatures; The Future of Rural New England; Burke: A Centenary Perspective; Jowett and the University Ideal; The Stony Pathway to the Woods by that delightful writer, Olive Thorne Miller; and Strauss the Author of the Life of Jesus. The readers of the *QUARTERLY* will find the July number filled with valuable matter.

The Century for July comes full of excellent articles just when the general reader has most time for it. Among the papers which will attract the most attention are the following: Old English Masters, Cole's New Series; Play in London; Campaigning with Grant; After Big Game in Africa and India: Hunting the Jaguar in Venezuela; Sports in the Seventeenth

Century; The Churches of Poitiers and Caen; Up the Matterhorn in a Boat; An American Citizen; and Are the Bosses Stronger than the People? The fiction of this number, poetry, Topics of the Time, Open Letters, and in Lighter Vein, are all up to the usual high grade of this excellent magazine.

St. Nicholas for July seems to have been gotten up with the idea of giving as much profit and pleasure as possible to its readers. All through the vacation days they will enjoy it. How Grandmother Met the Marquis de Lafayette; The Last of the Drums; The Chesapeake Mill; Hunting for Shells; A *fac-simile* Letter of George Washington's; The Little Drummer of the Woods; Girlhood Days of England's Queen; Honors to the Flag in Camp and Armory; and Brownies of the Insect World will all instruct the *St. Nicholas* readers, while a generous number of stories, poems, letters, puzzles and oh, so many lovely pictures will make the hours and days of July infinitely more delightful than they can be to those unfortunate young people who do not have the opportunity of reading this helpful magazine.

The July number of *Table Talk* must prove itself a welcome visitor in every household where it finds its way. It contains a number of timely articles but particularly acceptable are all the recipes for dainty and tempting Summer dishes. Many frozen dainties and hints for the various uses of the fruits of the season are given, and many valuable suggestions concerning the various interests of the home. Wherever *Table Talk* is really used there must be improved cooking, daintier and more acceptable service and, indeed, up-to-date housekeeping.



„ BETTER THAN EVER”

The 1897 BEN-HUR BICYCLES embody more new and genuine improvements in construction than any other bicycles now before the public. Never before have such excellent values been offered for the money. Our new line, consisting of eight superb models at \$60, \$75 and \$125 for single machines, and \$150 for tandems, with the various options offered, is such that the most exacting purchaser can be entirely suited.

CENTRAL CYCLE MFG. CO.,

72 GARDEN STREET.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

OUR FINE POSTER CATALOGUE MAILED FOR TWO 2-CENT STAMPS.